MASTER CARD

DO NOT REMOVE THIS CARD
FROM THIS BOOK.
PENALTY OF $2.00 IF CARD IS
LOST OR MUTILATED.

DREXEL LI
ST. JOS

MALEVINSKY M L
AUTHOR
ACC. NO. 40967 SCIENCE OF P

40967, PN 1661 .M24

SCIENCE OF PLAYWRIGTING
MALEVINSKY, M L

Library
Saint Joseph's University
5600 City Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131

THE SCIENCE OF PLAYWRITING

BY

MOSES L. MALEVINSKY

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

OWEN DAVIS

ST. JOSEPH'S UNIVERSITY STX
PN1661.M24
The science of playwriting,
3 9353 00132 2344

40967

PN
1661
.M24

NEW YORK
BRENTANO'S
PUBLISHERS

PN1661
M24

Copyright, 1925, by
MOSES L. MALEVINSKY

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This book is affectionately inscribed
to an old-fashioned girl who has ever
lighted the lamp of inspiration—
MY WIFE.

INTRODUCTION

It seems to me that in this algebraic formula of Mr. Malevinsky's he has done something more than give expression to the technic of the practiced dramatist, if indeed the practiced dramatist may be said to have a technic. Most of us, experienced in writing for the theater, have developed a sort of rule of thumb made up from the instinctive desire to avoid our own previous mistakes, something in the way that the "burned child learns to dread the fire," but a serious study of the rules that underlie play writing we usually leave to men of a more orderly form of mind. Thus, in reading over these articles of Mr. Malevinsky's, I bow in passing to many an old friend,—"this is so," "that I have found to be true," "experience has showed me this." Much as one may quarrel with Mr. Malevinsky's rather arbitrary method of determining the emotion that underlies a play, the fact remains, that plays are dominated by an emotion, that this emotion is expressed by the leading character and that the emotion brings about the plot, not the plot the emotion. If Mr. Malevinsky had done no more than point out, more clearly than any other writer of my knowledge, the difference between theme, plot and narrative, his work would have more than justified itself, for it is in a confusion of what is theme and

what is narrative that most of us go astray. It is, of course, a favorite saying that any set rules are impossible to a writer, that plays can not be written to measure, that all one can do is to have a story to tell and tell it, but surely it is better to tell your story so that the writer's meaning comes clearly to the audience, and to come clearly to the audience, Mr. Malevinsky believes, and I share in his belief, that it must first be clearly laid out in the author's mind. Good work is almost always careful work. Good technic at least can not hurt a writer. Just how much good technic can do is another question, much or little, depending on the individual. The hedge sparrow has, I imagine as good technic as the meadow lark, but only the songbird can sing.

OWEN DAVIS

June 30, 1925.

FOREWORD

A lawyer's approach is, as a rule, by way of precedent. Having been thus trained, the author naturally turned to the literature of the theatre and to the opinions of courts of equity in an effort to secure a comprehensive definition of a play. It was not to be found—either in the literature of the theatre or the law.

Before undertaking to present his own theory of the structure of drama, it seems not amiss to consider first what others have stated a play to be. For that reason the first chapter is devoted to résumé of a limited number of characteristic expressions on the part of sage and critic. In all the mass of dramatic lore one does not find a precise or complete definition. In the opinions of the courts one finds confusion worse confounded.

In offering this book to the public the author believes that it presents an entirely new and original concept of dramatic structure. If you, gentle reader, lack interest in what others have said a play is, or should be, and if you are not interested in what the courts have said upon the subject, dismiss and discard for the time being the first chapter of this book. Let the second chapter be your beginning. If, after reading the remainder, upon second thought you have curiosity to linger awhile with the subject *a priori*, return to Chapter I. The arrange-

ment of the book by chapters follows the constituent elements of the Algebraic Formula. The scheme of the book is intended first to indicate, in some measure, what has gone before and then to present to the reader in consecutive evolution the constituent elements of a play. The effort of the author has been to present his view and to demonstrate that successful playwriting is governed by fundamental laws and principles. The point of view is legal, analytical, mathematical. It is believed, nevertheless, that an understanding reading will furnish a key to dramatic craftsmanship. The Algebraic Formula not only shows you what a play *is* when written,—its content—but *how it should be written*. We fain would write in modesty as Viola spoke:

> ". . . she never told her love,
> But let concealment like a worme i' th budde
> Feede on her damaske cheeke: she pin'd in thought,
> And with a greene and yellow melancholly,
> She sate like Patience on a Monument,
> Smiling at greefe."

Time alone will demonstrate whether the author has added to the sum of dramatic learning.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Playwriting is a Science	1
II	What is a Play?	38
III	Discovery of the Algebraic Formula	40
IV	The Conception of a Play	43
V	The Basic Emotion, or Element in or of a Basic Emotion, Constituting the Theme	47
VI	The Theme of the Play Continued	63
VII	Emotion as Primal Cause	86
VIII	The Law of the Play	107
IX	Personified by Character	110
X	Subsidiary or Secondary Emotions of a Basic or Secondary Character	142
XI	Motivation Through Crucible, Conflict, Complication and (or) Intrigue to Ultimate Crisis and Climax	150
XII	Progression by Narrative, Plot or Story	233
XIII	The Plot of "A Doll's House"	240
XIV	The Plot of "The Madras House"	243
XV	Compartmented by Derivative Situations	251
XVI	Dressed up by Incidental Detailed Construction	262
XVII	Orientation	282
XVIII	Dialogue—Articulated by Words	291
XIX	Imaged with Artistry	321
XX	Literary Piracy and Copyright Infringement	329
	Index	347

THE SCIENCE OF PLAYWRITING

CHAPTER I

PLAYWRITING IS A SCIENCE

First and last there have been many attempts at a definition of playwriting. Some writers on the drama have declared it to be an art, others a science; but that it is both an art and a science is probably nearer the truth.

Freytag in his "Technique of the Drama" (MacEwan edition) at page 7 says: ". . . Sophocles used the fundamental laws of dramatic construction, with enviable certainty and shrewdness."

At page 22: "Each participant in the dramatic action has a definite appointment with reference to the whole; for each, an exact, circumscribed personality is necessary, which must be so constituted that so much of it as has a purpose may be conveniently perceived by the auditor, and what is common to man and what is peculiar to this character may be effectively represented by the actor by means of his art."

Again at page 304: "The first law, that of unity, admits of still another application to the char-

acters: The drama must have only one chief hero, about whom all the persons, however great their number, arrange themselves in different gradations. The drama has a thoroughly monarchic arrangement; the unity of its action is essentially dependent on this, that the action is perfected about one dominant character. But also for a sure effect, the first condition is that the interest of the spectator must be directed mostly toward one person, and he must learn as early as possible who is to occupy his attention before all other characters. Since the highest dramatic processes of but few persons can be exhibited in broad elaboration, the number of great rôles is limited to a few; and it is a common experience that nothing is more painful to the hearer than the uncertainty as to what interest he should give to each of these important persons. It is also one practical advantage of the piece to direct its effects toward a single middle point.

"Whoever deviates from this fundamental law must do so with the keen perception that he surrenders a great advantage; and if his subject-matter makes this surrender necessary, he must, in doubt, ask himself whether the uncertainty thus arising in the effects, will be counter-balanced by other dramatic advantages."

In Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," at page 381, Victor Hugo is quoted as follows: " 'The drama, therefore, must be a concentrating mirror, which, instead of weakening, concentrates and condenses the colored rays, which makes of a mere gleam

a light, and of a light a flame. Then only is the drama acknowledged by art.' "

In the same work Alexandre Dumas fils is quoted at page 384, as follows: " '. . . the knowledge of foreground and background, keeping the figure which ought to stand out in the high-light from falling into the shadow, and those which belong in the middle-distance from assuming a position of too great prominence; and then the mathematical precision, inexorable, fatal, which multiplies scene by scene, event by event, act by act, up to the denouement, which must be the sum total, the Q.E.D.; . . .' "

Sarcey, in the same work, is quoted at page 390 as follows: " 'Rules do not render any great service in criticizing any more than they do in creating. The best that can be said for them is that they may serve as directions or guide-posts.

. . . . . .

" 'It is customary in seeking a definition of dramatic art to say that drama is a representation of life. Now, assuredly drama is a representation of life. But when one has said that, he has said no great thing; and he has taught nothing to those whom he has furnished with this formula.' "

Again, at page 393: " 'It is not sufficient simply to affirm that drama is the representation of life. It would be a more exact definition to say that dramatic art is the sum total of the conventions, universal or local, permanent or temporary, by the aid of which in

representing life in the theater, the audience is given the illusion of truth.' "

Again, at page 394: " 'In drama, as one may conceive it, even though he is unable to write it, everything is linked together and everything follows in sequence as in real life.' "

At page 399: " 'I have here chosen purposely as examples works very diverse in tone and in style in order to show that this great law of the unity of impression—without which there is no possibility of illusion for an audience of twelve hundred persons—has been observed instinctively by all the playwrights who were truly endowed with the comic genius.' "

Gordon Craig says ("On the Art of the Theatre," page 9): ". . . this same instinctive knowledge doubles or even trebles its power when guided by scientific knowledge, that is to say, by art."

At page 71 he says: "Surely there must be laws at the roots of the Art of the Theatre, . . ."

At page 111 he says: "How then can it obtain this form? Only by developing slowly under the laws. And these laws? I have searched for them, and I believe I am finding some of them."

Clayton Hamilton says ("Studies in Stagecraft," page 83): "There have been many periods in the history of the drama— . . . during which every tragedy or comedy of any excellence has been constructed in accordance with a single formula, a formula in each case invented by a group of minor artists and developed

to its fullest fruition by the dominant dramatic genius of the age."

Again, at page 84, Mr. Hamilton says: "All that Aristotle had to do was to explain inductively the structural principles which had been employed by Sophocles, and his treatise became at once a text-book for all subsequent authors of Greek tragedy."

W. T. Price says ("The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," page 7): "Technique is science and art."

At page 11 Mr. Price says: ". . . Analysis can only be applied by him who has a knowledge of the art. . . . Analysis gets at the truth. . . . It enables one to use the principles as tools."

At page 17 he says: "While playwriting is an art, it is an art in the nature of an exact science. As a science it has certain fundamental truths which, like the axioms in geometry, must be accepted as a necessary prerequisite to a proper understanding of the art as attempted to be developed in the following pages."

Barrett H. Clark in "A Study of the Modern Drama," at page 310, quotes Henry James, as follows: " 'The novel, as practiced in English, is the perfect paradise of the loose end, . . .' whereas the 'play consents to the logic of but one way, mathematically right, and with the loose end as gross an impertinence on its surface and as grave a dishonor as the dangle of a snippet of silk or wool on the right side of a tapestry.' "

In "The Changing Drama" by Archibald Hender-

son, at page 188, it is said: "The moment one enters the theater he becomes a willing believer in the artificial operations of a mimic world, ruled by many laws and governed by many conventions, which do not obtain in the world of actuality."

For centuries the activities of men have included playwriting. Aristotle first undertook to say, in a concrete way, what a play *may* or *may not* be. Mr. Barrett H. Clark's monumental work entitled "European Theories of the Drama" contains a chronological and historical development of critical analyses by master craftsmen—from Aristotle to Archer. A careful reading of that volume, and the theories presented, do not contain a consecutive formula, nor may one find an analytical or truly comprehensive definition of —a *play*.

Mr. Baker says ("Dramatic Technique," page 520): "Play-making is an exceedingly difficult art, and in so far as it is in any sense a transcript from life or a beautified presentation of life past, present, or imagined, it grows more difficult as the years pass because of the accumulating mass of dramatic masterpieces."

Mr. Archer says ("Play-Making," page 3): "There are no rules for writing a play."

Mr. Wilde says ("The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play," page 33): "A play is an orderly representation of life, arousing emotion in an audience."

Mr. Charlton Andrews, in his "The Technique of Playwriting" (glossary), defines drama as follows:

"Drama—A story, containing a fundamental element of conflict; composed of a unified sequence of events; having a beginning, a middle and an end; and told in action—usually by means of dialogue—by the personages taking part in it."

Mr. Andrews quotes Mr. Barker, as follows: " 'A play,' declares Mr. H. Granville Barker, 'is anything that can be made effective upon the stage of a theatre by human agency. And I am sure,' he adds, in revolutionary good measure, 'that this definition is not too narrow.' "

Mr. B. Roland Lewis says ("The Technique of the One-Act Play," page 28): "A play is a story of human life so conceived and so handled as to arouse the attention and to provoke the emotional response of a group of people who have assembled to witness a presentation of it."

Mr. Henry Arthur Jones says (Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 469): " 'Drama arises when any person or persons in a play are consciously or unconsciously "up against" some antagonistic person, or circumstance, or fortune. It is often more intense, when as in Œdipus, the audience is aware of the obstacle, and the person himself or persons on the stage are unaware of it. Drama arises thus, and continues when or till the person or persons are unaware of the obstacle; it is sustained so long as we watch the reaction physical, mental, or spiritual, of the person or persons to the opposing person, or cir-

cumstance, or fortune. It relaxes as this reaction subsides, and ceases when the reaction is complete. This reaction of a person to an obstacle is most arresting and intense when the obstacle takes the form of another human will in almost balanced collision.' "

Archibald Henderson, in "The Changing Drama," says, at page 180: "A play is any presentation of human life by human interpreters on a stage in a theater before a representative audience."

If Mr. Henderson's definition is to be accepted, a manuscript or printed play does not become a play until it is presented in a theater.

In "A Study of the Modern Drama," by Barrett H. Clark, at page 81 he says: "The eternal question 'What is a play?' is likely to arise every time we see or read a drama that differs in any way from our (conscious or unconscious) standards of what a drama ought to be."

At page 320 he says: "It has been said—with what justice I am well aware—that masterpieces cannot be analyzed, that art appeals or it does not appeal. It is possible, however, to study, consider—yes, analyze—works of art, though it is impossible to dissect the life and soul of art, as it is the life and soul of man. But art, being an expression of life, can be studied and analyzed just as life itself is studied and analyzed. A man reveals himself in words and deeds. It is thus that plays reveal their characters, and thus that this

play—like any other—can be profitably scrutinized scene for scene and act for act."

The foregoing definitions and statements, which are characteristic and which may be multiplied *ad infinitum*, mean *much* or *little*—dependent upon the reader's point of view. Is it an unwarranted contention to say that a play is capable of, and susceptible to, definitive analysis? Is it or is it not possible to secure accurate, precise, definitive and all-inclusive terminology? Is a scientific or truly artistic play certain in its ratiocination? We are not concerned with, nor discussing *entertainment*. An entertainment *may* or *may not* be a play. The thing that this volume undertakes to analyze, discuss and dissect is—a play—*The Play*.

The distinction between *a play* and *an entertainment* is forcibly presented in many of the lectures of Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, who says ("The Foundations of a National Drama," page 17): ". . . it is necessary: (1) To distinguish and separate our drama from popular amusement; to affirm and reaffirm that popular amusement and the art of the drama are totally different things; and that there is a higher and greater pleasure to be obtained from the drama than from popular amusement." (See also "Foundations of a National Drama," page 108.)

Law libraries contain innumerable cases involving literary piracy and copyright infringement. One will

search these cases in vain for a scientific definition of what constitutes a *play*. In no reported case are the constituent elements of a play presented in consecutive development. Is not this due to the fact that heretofore the entire body of criticism has not presented a definitive analysis of the elements of a play—an analysis by which the elemental purposes of a concrete play may be laid open and dissected as with a surgeon's scalpel? Is it not for this reason that literary piracy and copyright infringement have become rampant and often go unwhipped of justice?

Illustrative opinions of courts, indicating the difficulties encountered in infringement cases, may be resorted to in support of the postulate that heretofore there has been formulated no guiding compass by which the constituent elements of a play may be segregated and indicated.

In the case of *International Film S. Co. v. Affiliated Distributers*, 283 Fed. Rep. p. 231, Judge Knox wrote: "This rather lengthy preamble has been thought appropriate to my discussion of the merits of the matter here involved, to the end that, from the viewpoint thus had, a somewhat more discerning comparison may be made between the leading incidents and events set forth in the scenario written by Schrock and embodied in the picture 'I Am the Law,' and those contained in Curwood's story, 'The Valley of Silent Men.' The synopsis of 'I Am the Law,' as detailed by the defendant Burr, is as follows:

" 'Two brothers were members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police at the little settlement of Paradise. One, Corporal Fitzgerald, was counted the best man-tracker in the north and a credit to the Mounted; his younger and weak brother, Tom, private, had often been reprimanded for misconduct (by the commandant), and at the time the story opens he was carrying on a secret affair with the wife of the commanding officer at the post. The corporal had learned of it, and reproved his brother, but Tom defied him. A school-teacher, Joan Cameron, in traveling through the forest, had been caught in a storm, and had taken refuge at the notorious dance hall conducted by a half-breed Chinaman, who was pressing his advances upon her when the corporal arrived and killed him. After rescuing the teacher, the two encountered Tom, who made love to her and won her promise to marry him. The corporal, who had fallen in love with her, resigned in favor of his younger brother and wished them well.

" 'The commanding officer at the post started on a journey, and Tom lost no time in going to his home and resuming his love affair with the false wife. Forgetting some papers, the officer returned home, to find Tom and his wife drinking together and caressing each other. He lashed Tom with a dog whip, and Tom got possession of his revolver and shot him dead. Tom took the dead man's dog team and escaped into the wilds. The call of duty forced the corporal to pursue his brother. They met in a blizzard on a mountain

side, and after a struggle the corporal was thrown down the mountain side. Tom found refuge in the cabin of the school-teacher, where later the corporal found him and placed him under arrest. In reply to his brother's entreaty the corporal could only answer "I am the law."

" 'The storm grew worse, and the corporal's exposure brought on pneumonia. He felt he was dying, and could not bear the thought of his widowed mother losing him by illness, and her younger son upon the gallows. So he had paper and pen brought him, and he wrote and signed a confession to the murder. Then he dropped back upon the cot, apparently dead; but with Joan's nursing he recovered. Exonerated by the confession, Tom returned to the settlement, presented the confession, and reported his brother as dead. But a trapper had stopped at Joan's cabin, perhaps a couple of weeks after Tom left it. He found the corporal sitting up and well. Upon arriving at the post, the trapper reported this, and Tom was sent back to arrest and bring in his brother, which he did.

" 'The corporal was thrown into jail at the post, and was to be taken to a larger town for trial. But a mob formed, the corporal was dragged from the jail, and about to be lynched. Joan rushed to the widow of the murdered man, and pleaded with her to tell the truth and save the corporal. After a struggle with the woman she succeeded, got her out to the mob and her confession was believed. The mob released the cor-

poral and started back to get Tom, who saw them coming and committed suicide. The corporal and Joan were married, and we leave them starting on a honeymoon trip with their dog sled."

"A synopsis of "The Valley of Silent Men," as prepared on behalf of plaintiffs, reads: 'A company of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police is garrisoned in a little village, its jurisdiction extending for a distance of 2000 miles. The hero, a sergeant of the Mounted Police, James Grenfell Kent, was shot in the chest by an outlaw two weeks before the story opens, and as the story opens Kent is lying in his bed, a dying man. He has been told by a physician that he is dying, and he believes that his end may come within two or three days.

" 'In the barracks there is confined one Sandy McTrigger, who, ten years before, had befriended Kent and nursed him through a serious illness and saved his life. McTrigger has been jailed on the charge that he killed one John Barkeley. Kent, believing himself to be dying, and anxious to repay his debt to McTrigger, sends for Kedsty, the commandant of the platoon of police, and a number of witnesses, and in their presence makes a statement to the effect that he, and not Sandy McTrigger, killed John Barkeley. McTrigger is thereupon released by Kedsty, and McTrigger's daughter, Marette, comes into the sick room and falls in love with Kent.

" 'Kent does not die. On the contrary, his wound

heals, and he realizes that he is going to live, and that he will be hanged as a murderer on his own signed confession. Kedsty, the villain in the book, has placed Kent under arrest. Kent makes a futile effort to escape, is recaptured, locked in a cell in the barracks, but Marette rescues him, and Kedsty is killed, and Kent and Marette flee down the river, pursued by the police launch. Their scow is wrecked in the rapids, and Kent and Marette are separated, each believing the other to be drowned. Subsequently they are united in the Valley of Silent Men, and the mystery of John Barkeley's death and Kedsty's death is cleared up, and Kent learns the story of retribution that has pursued Barkeley and Kedsty for a crime they had committed many years before.'

"Each of the principal parties to this controversy criticizes the synopsis as prepared by the opposing side as not clearly and fairly setting forth the dominant note contained in the respective stories. As a commentary upon what each such dominant note actually is, it may be well to quote from advertising matter of the book, and from a synopsis of the 'I Am the Law' picture which appeared in *Motion Picture World* of May 27, 1922. Such quotations, it may be assumed, are free from any prejudice or interest growing out of the litigation. The matter about to be quoted is in evidence, not only without objection, but by consent.

"The printed cover of the book edition of 'The Valley of Silent Men' contained this language:

'When he thought he was dying, Sergeant Kent, the best man-trapper in the Royal Mounted, told a story that branded him as a murderer and set another man free. But the doctor's diagnosis was wrong; death by hanging grinned in the trooper's face. Love of life and of a beautiful girl, who had laughed at him and called him a liar, now made him a fugitive—a hunter become the hunted. With him, down those fabled rivers flowing north to the frozen Arctic, sped the girl, whose own secret winds like a thread of wild magic to the hidden Valley of Silent Men.'

"The following comment on 'I Am the Law' appeared in the *Motion Picture News* of May 27, 1922: 'The Story.—Officer of Mounted, believing he is going to die, assumes guilt of his brother's crime—the latter also a member of Mounted. The good brother recovers, and the other holds him to his confession and actually arrests him. Eventually, sweetheart of officer secures confession of victim's wife, and the bad brother kills himself to avoid a hanging.'

"I should say that the purport of those quotations is that in each story the confession of the Royal Mounted trooper gives to the remaining subject-matter of the tale an impetus of interest, and arouses a suspense, that continues until the dénouement of the contretemps created by such confessions. Indeed, from the stories themselves, and aside from the quoted comment, I find this to be the fact.

"In a book entitled 'The Thirty-Six Dramatic Situa-

tions' by Georges Polti, and introduced in evidence by defendant, I read this quotation attributed to Goethe: 'Gozzi maintained that there can be but thirty-six tragic situations. Schiller took great pains to find more, but he was unable to find even so many as Gozzi.'

"From this, it is argued that in having Sergeant Kent, when he believed himself about to die, make a false confession, Curwood merely used an old and time-worn expedient of creating and holding interest, and that neither he nor his assignees can properly complain because Schrock pursued a similar course for a similar purpose. Then, too, it is suggested, and properly so, that Curwood has no monopoly upon Canadian Northwest stories, and no pre-emption of Royal Mounted Police as characters to act therein. These are admittedly subjects of literary material well within the public domain.

"But, while this is true, such subject-matter may be so utilized, as to setting, atmosphere, sequence of events, and detail of narrative, as to constitute an infringement upon the work of one who, while using old and well-known means, has created a novel situation. As was said by Judge Shipman in *Banks v. McDivitt*, (2 Fed. Cas. 759, No. 961), an author—'. . . may work on the same original materials, but he cannot exclusively and evasively use those already collected and embodied by the skill and industry and expenditures of another.'

"Some of the outstanding points of similarity be-

tween the two stories are: In each instance the hero and the villain are members of the Royal Mounted Police. Between these characters there exists until near the end of each story an element of conflict that ultimately is resolved in favor of the hero. In each story the hero is the 'best man-trapper' in the service, and in each he confesses to a crime of which he was not guilty, and for which the penalty was death by hanging. So, too, does each man-hunter become the hunted. Each is finally arrested and confined in the barracks jail, and deliverance comes or begins to come while each awaits transportation to another place for trial. In both stories the only sacrifice the hero believes himself to be making was that of his posthumous reputation, the thought that he would personally be called upon to expiate the crime he had admitted was never appreciated until after the confession had been put forth, and in each case the hero, when he realized possibilities of harm therefrom, had at hand the love of the heroine to sustain him. So, also, do both heroes and heroines resort to flight to escape the consequences of the false confession.

"It is likewise a circumstance worthy of comment that, according to both tales, the confession goes directly into the hands of a man calculated to profit thereby, and he, in each instance, ultimately comes to an untimely end. Possibly other points of similarity might be found, but I am of the opinion that such as have been specified are sufficient to indicate that the

'same use is made . . . of the same series of events to excite, by representation, the same emotions, in the same sequence.' *Daly v. Palmer* (6 Fed. Cas. 1138, No. 3,552).

"From a careful examination of this record, including the presentation to me of the motion pictures constructed from the Schrock scenario, and from the story of 'The Valley of Silent Men,' I am constrained to believe that the theme or subject of the latter has in part, at least, been dramatized by defendants in their picture; that it has been reproduced through scenes and incidents coupled with situations by which one of the kernels of Curwood's composition is emphasized. *Dam v. Kirk La Shelle* (C.C. 166 Fed. 589). From this I am forced to the conclusion that there was an effort and design, notwithstanding denials upon the part of Schrock, and of Burr and his associates, that none of them had, prior to this litigation, read Curwood's story, to reap a profit or gain out of material in which others had an exclusive right. This conclusion is supported by the strenuous efforts made by Burr to obtain the privilege of making a motion picture upon the Curwood story, 'The Poetic Justice of Uko San,' and of the use made of Curwood's name in connection with the picture, 'I Am the Law,' once the 'Uko San' story was acquired."

. . . . . .

In the case of *Eichel v. Marcin* (241 Fed. Rep.) Judge Manton wrote: "The defendant Max Marcin

claims to be the author of a play registered for copyright called 'Cheating Cheaters.' The defendant Woods produced the play on the 9th of August, 1916, at the Eltinge Theater, New York City, where it has been playing since. The Eltinge Theater is controlled by A. H. Woods Theater Company. Woods is the president and general manager of the Cheating Cheaters Company.

"The plaintiffs claim they are the sole and exclusive proprietors and owners of a satirical melodramatic farce or play entitled 'Wedding Presents,' written and composed by them jointly, that it has never been published or produced in this or any foreign country, and that it was copyrighted under the copyright law of the United States under the title of 'Wedding Presents' on the 18th of December, 1915. The latter part of January, 1916, the plaintiffs submitted a copy of this play entitled 'Wedding Presents' to the defendant Woods, by leaving a copy thereof at his office, the Eltinge Theater, with a Mr. Hoffenstein, then connected in business with said defendant. This dramatic composition was returned to the plaintiffs about two months later. The inference sought to be drawn, and the claim by the plaintiffs, is that the title of this composition was changed to 'Cheating Cheaters,' and the play has been stolen, in violation of the plaintiffs' copyright, and the defendants should be restrained from producing it longer. The bill of complaint asks for the usual relief of damages in addition to an injunction.

"Marcin, a playwright by profession, has produced such well-known plays as 'The House of Glass' and 'See My Lawyer.' Prior thereto he was a reporter and author, and had written several novels and a number of short stories, which have been published in current magazines. He declares that his previous stories were so-called detective stories and were built upon detective plots. 'Cheating Cheaters' is a crook play, with a woman detective as the leading figure. It has had a full season's run, and has proven very successful dramatically and financially, and therefore has had the approval of the theater-going public. Marcin swears the first act and part of the second were written as early as January, 1915, and in the month of January, 1915, he read to the defendant Woods the part written at that time and outlined the balance of the proposed play. It pleased Woods, and he then agreed to finish the production, which he did in April, 1916. He explains his delay in the production of the finished manuscript, stating that he was engaged in preparing the plays 'The House of Glass' and 'See My Lawyer.' He denies any knowledge of the manuscript 'Wedding Presents,' and the story therein told, until the present action was instituted. Woods makes substantially the same claim. The affidavit of Woods' representative, Mr. Hoffenstein, denies the use of the play 'Wedding Presents,' and, indeed, deposes that he never as much as finished its reading. Briefly stated, the story of 'Wedding Presents' is as follows:

"The main idea is based upon the skillful attempt of Jack Barnes, the son of a police commissioner, who, in order to win the girl with whom he is in love and the consent of his father to the match, undertakes to apprehend a notorious band of thieves known as the 'wedding present trio.' After a honeymoon, a young couple return to their home and employ a maid called Marie. She is in fact Jack Barnes. The wedding presents are displayed, a notorious gang known as the 'wedding present trio,' much sought by the police, makes entry into the apartment by means of an aëroplane, landing on the front balcony of the house, this through permission obtained from the superintendent of the building. Marie assumes the identity of 'Chicago Nell,' a notorious crook, and with the butler, Dennison, find themselves in this home. The famous Dunne jewels and the wedding presents become the object of their plans. Other characters, Second Story Smith, Frenchy, the aviator, and Frisco Kate, the bogus Lady Dunne, are introduced. These crooks, fearing the proximity of the police, endeavor to take immediate action. Barnes, the detective, disguised as Marie, secures the employment, feeling that the 'wedding present trio' will be attracted to the Dunne household by newspaper reports of the arrival of the famous Dunne jewels and the wedding presents. A robbery of the house is planned at midnight. Carlo arranges to have Barnes accepted as the new maid in the Dunne household. Frisco Kate, one of the 'Wedding Trio' dis-

guised as Lady Dunne herself, bringing imitation jewels, asks for a safe place, and in that way secures the combination of the wall safe, in which the jewels are placed with the jewels of the newlyweds.

"Dennison informs Marie, who he thinks is Chicago Nell, of the appearance of the crooks, and Marie is caught by bogus Commissioner Barnes tampering with the safe. She agrees to assist him in securing these jewels and participate with him in the robbery at midnight. Marie, in reality being Jack Barnes, the detective, has penetrated the disguise of Frisco Kate, or the bogus Lady Dunne, and constantly thwarts her as she wanders about. At midnight, the time planned for the robbery, bogus Commissioner Barnes learns of the duplicity of Henri, who is not on hand to aid him, and resolves to force Marie to assist in opening the safe. Marie tries to do so, but her plans are frustrated. Bogus Commissioner Barnes, or Second Story Smith, realizing the need for immediate action, arouses all the crooks and arranges for a clean get-away. To carry out his plans, he promises to arrest Henri, Dennison, and Marie, and, playing the part of the real Police Commissioner, he places the other members of the Dunne household about the room supposedly armed. Frisco Kate suddenly appears, and, finding the imitation jewels from the safe, claims that she has been robbed, when the real Lady Dunne appears on the scene bringing with her the real Dunne jewels. Bogus Commissioner Barnes, or Second Story Smith, takes pos-

session of the jewels, and Marie, who has now succeeded in getting all the crooks together, exposes the bogus Lady Dunne as Frisco Kate, and charges her with having tried to double-cross the others. Bogus Commissioner Barnes, now confident, and believing that he has successfully secured the jewels, is about to leave, when the real Commissioner Barnes enters. Second Story Smith now stands revealed as the leader of the 'wedding present trio,' and suggests that all the crooks make a get-away with a clean million in booty. Marie, who now suddenly turns upon him covers him and the rest of the crooks, and after freeing the police commissioner's hands, they having been tied, turns the 'trio' over to him as prisoners. Marie is now revealed, not as a maid, but as Jack Barnes, son of the commissioner, who has successfully rounded up all the crooks without a struggle.

"The story of 'Cheating Cheaters,' for the purpose of comparison, may be stated as follows:

"Ruth Ferris, a young newspaper woman, who has displayed considerable skill in the investigation of news items concerning the doings of criminals, is offered a position at $75 a week by one of the burglary insurance companies. She accepts, and displays exceptional skill as an investigator, so much so that she resolves to go in the business for herself. The Ferris Detective Agency is established, and she has as her principal customers various burglary insurance companies which she has organized into a Mutual Protec-

tive Association. Ira Lazarre, a lawyer, has appeared for many years with suspicious regularity as counsel for the more prosperous members of the underworld. The authorities have entertained the belief that Lazarre has not only acted as counsel for the criminals, but has participated in their crimes to the extent of being an adviser and backer. Ruth Ferris determines to apprehend Lazarre, and enters into an arrangement with the district attorney whereby she is arrested as a shoplifter and lodged in the Tombs. She employs Lazarre, and he succeeds in gaining her acquittal before a jury. She easily convinces the lawyer that she is a highly gifted crook, and he places her with a company of high-class jewel thieves, known as the 'Brockton gang.' The Brocktons are located in an expensive suburban home, not owned by them, but rented and furnished. They masquerade as persons of eminent respectability, and are accepted as such by respectable neighbors, the Palmer family. The Brocktons are waiting to dispose of some stolen jewels. The unsuspected Ruth Ferris lives among them as Nan Brockton. George Brockton, head of the gang, finally decides to dispose of the stones in Europe, and takes Nan Brockton (Ruth Ferris) along on the trip. She poses as his daughter. Just as they arrive on the other side, the war breaks out and obviously it is useless to endeavor to market the jewels under such circumstances. They return to America, and on the boat Ruth meets Tom Palmer. They discover that they are neighbors, and, moreover,

it is discovered by an exchange of confidences that the other is in possession of valuable jewels. On the second day of the return trip, the ship strikes a mine, Palmer's heroism results in saving the lives of many, including Ruth and George Brockton. Ruth, first impressed with Tom's heroic conduct, admires him, and then grows to love him. Tom falls in love with her. In this state of bliss, the Palmers and Brocktons become neighbors in a suburb of New York. Brockton and the Brockton gang, realizing that their future perpetration of crimes will become more difficult and dangerous, resolve to make one last big capture, and that the Palmer jewels. Ruth allows herself to be used as the apparent decoy to ensnare Tom Palmer, and through him enable the gang to steal the Palmer collection. The Palmers are invited to tea at the Brocktons' home. A frame-up is then arranged, so that the Brockton gang may go into the Palmer home. The Palmers arrive while Ruth is taking a music lesson from an Italian instructor named Verdi, alias Tony the Wop. They are told that Ruth is to play at the professor's concert and show great interest in it. Suddenly Brockton receives a telegram. This is a false message calling him and Mrs. Brockton to Chicago. It is stated that Ruth will have to accompany them, as it would be improper to allow her to remain in the house alone with the butler. Great distress is displayed, as this will prevent her playing at the concert of the Italian professor. This disappointment, how-

ever, is overcome by the acceptance of the Palmers' invitation to become their guest and remain at their home during her father's absence. She takes up her abode with the Palmers, and, while there, it is arranged that the Italian professor visit her. The departure of the Palmers is followed by a celebration on the part of the Brocktons, who now see the Palmer jewels within their grasp. So sure are they of capturing the gems that Ruth instructs them in advance to scatter to South America, where the proceeds of the theft are to be marketed. She ends her instructions to the gang with the remark: 'Well, boys, it looks like a good day's work for us.' The second act is laid in the Palmer home. Ruth learns the location of the safe and the jewels therein, and the combination of the wall safe, which is electrically protected. This information she passes to her confederates, and it is then decided to rob the house at midnight. Tom Palmer renews his avowal of love to Ruth and asks her to become his wife. At this time she rejects him. Other members of the Palmer family, entering the room, interrupt this love scene. Ruth goes to her room to dress for dinner. In the ensuing scene it is revealed that the Palmers are likewise a gang of crooks, and, just as the Brocktons have been planning to get the Palmer jewels, so the Palmers have been planning to get the Brockton valuables. The Palmers consider that they are certain of obtaining the Brockton jewels, and Tom instructs his gang in advance to scatter to South America, where

they will dispose of the jewels. His instructions end with the same remark: 'Well, boys, it looks like a good day's work for us.'

"In the third act, Tom Palmer and one of his gang enter the Brockton house under the belief that the other members of the household are out of the city. Unexpectedly they are at home. Tom is captured in the act of rifling a lamp in which the Brockton jewels are secreted. For the first time the Brocktons realize that their respectable friends are jewel thieves, and they pretend the deepest indignation of this violation of their home. Tom and his confederates are securely tied and locked in separate rooms, while the Brockton gang leaves the house to cross over to the Palmer house for the purpose of an easy robbery. The curtain drops. At the rise of the curtain Ruth enters. She has with her the Palmer jewels, which she has taken from the safe. She finds Tom and his confederates, but still pretends ignorance of their real character. Tom confesses that he is a crook and pleads to be allowed to escape. The Brockton gang return. They are highly indignant and angry, because they have broken into the Palmer home only to find the safe empty. They accuse Ruth of having double-crossed them, but are elated on learning that Ruth has all the Palmer jewels. Tom Palmer now realizes for the first time that Ruth and the Brocktons are likewise crooks. He proposes that the two gangs consolidate and form a syndicate, pooling their loot and acting in concert thereafter.

While they are seated about a table, discussing ways and means, the doors and windows are suddenly smashed in and a company of detectives from the Ferris Agency appear and apprehend both gangs. The leader of the detectives, elated at the number of prisoners and the value of the booty scattered on the table, turns to his companions with the remark: 'Well, boys, it looks like a good day's work for us.'

"The fourth act is in the office of the Ferris Detective Agency. Here all the prisoners appear. Lazarre, who has been arrested, tries to show a way to beat the case, but their hopes fade when Ruth reveals herself as Ruth Ferris. Her love for Tom is real, and for his sake she has arranged for the capture of both gangs, under circumstances that enable her to dispose of them as she sees fit. She points out that all their lives they have been preying on society, and she intends now to compel them to enter her agency and help protect society. Faced by the alternative of twenty years in jail, all the crooks reluctantly write their confessions and agree to her terms.

"In 'Wedding Presents' the hero is Jack Barnes, son of the police commissioner. Because of the supposed failure of his father to be able to apprehend the 'wedding present trio,' and in order to save his father's position, he volunteers to run down the 'wedding present trio' and feels that by this service in the end his father's objection to his marriage to the girl he loves will disappear. He disguises himself as a woman

and comes in contact with the crooks as a bogus housemaid.

"In 'Cheating Cheaters,' two gangs of crooks endeavor to rob each other of certain famous jewels, which each gang has stolen at previous periods. A female detective named Ferris, posing as a member of one of these gangs, eventually arrests both, and recaptures all of the stolen jewels for their legitimate owners. Ferris falls in love with one of the thieves, and he falls in love with her. Because of this love, the woman detective saves the thief, and turns his companions and all the crooks into useful members of society as detectives.

"The scene in 'Wedding Presents' is an apartment house in New York in all three acts, while that in 'Cheating Cheaters' is in a mansion in one of the suburbs of New York. The second act is in a neighboring mansion five miles distant, and the fourth act is in the office of a detective agency. The characters, fifteen in number in 'Wedding Presents,' and thirteen in 'Cheating Cheaters,' are not similar in point of motive, make-up, or dialogue. In 'Cheating Cheaters' there are two gangs of crooks, and, while it might be said there are two gangs of crooks in 'Wedding Presents,' I do not think there is a similarity of characters, as claimed by the plaintiffs. The landing on the balcony of the eleventh floor of a Riverside apartment in an aëroplane and its subsequent flight across the Hudson river is far-fetched. It is impossible that such a machine could come and go from the 3 x 8 foot balconv.

"(1) The object of copyright is to promote science and the useful arts. If an author, by originating a new arrangement and form of expression of certain ideas or conceptions, could withdraw these ideas or conceptions from the stock of materials to be used by other authors, each copyright would narrow the field of thought open for development and exploitation, and science, poetry, narrative, and dramatic fiction and other branches of literature would be hindered by copyright, instead of being promoted. A poem consists of words, expressing conceptions of words or lines of thoughts; but copyright in the poem gives no monopoly in the separate works, or in the ideas, conceptions, or facts expressed or described by the words. A copyright extends only to the arrangements of the words. A copyright does not give a monopoly in any incident in a play. Other authors have a right to exploit the facts, experiences, field of thought, and general ideas, provided they do not substantially copy a concrete form, in which the circumstances and ideas have been developed, arranged, and put into shape. *Holmes v. Hurst* (174 U. S. 82, 19 Sup. Ct. 606, 43 L. Ed. 904.)

"(2) The plaintiffs have prepared a chart in which they point out the similarities in the two plays, and they claim that their composition may be called a 'crook play,' in which two bands of crooks are trying to cheat each other, and that the subjects of their cheating are some famous jewels; further, that both plays deal with

thieves masquerading as respectable citizens, detectives, and robbery planned and carried out as an inside job, and then that the big surprise is that the leading crook is in reality a detective, and then, of course a love affair.

"But the idea of showing a band of thieves in action is as old as the idea of a man impersonating a female for the purpose of detecting crime. This was well exploited in 'The Crinoline Girl.' The court has been furnished with the manuscript of this play. In 'The Crinoline Girl' Tom Hale hears of a $25,000 reward for the recovery of a necklace and other jewelry stolen by a gang of thieves who specialize in fancy dress balls as the theater of their prey. When the lights are put out, the thieves lift the jewels from the guests, a woman confederate then drops them out of the window to a waiting partner, robing herself anew in a dress smuggled into the house for that purpose. Hale, in discovering the thieves at a ball, overpowers this female character, assumes her disguise, and finally succeeds, through this disguise, in capturing the thieves and turning them over to the authorities.

"The subject of stealing wedding presents was pretty well exploited in 'Stop Thief,' which was played in New York in 1912. On the eve of the wedding of a youth, who is troubled with fits of kleptomania, a lady's maid is introduced into the house. The best-man, knowing the groom is subject to taking things, unconsciously, that do not belong to him, tries with the

bride, who knows his failing, to keep this a secret. The lady's maid turns out to be an advance agent for a thief, a man whom she is to marry. He arrives after she has looked over the place, and together they lay ingenious plans for relieving the house of the wedding presents. The easy-going thief is thought, by the kleptomaniac, to be the detective he had sent for, and accuses himself of having removed the valuables that are already beginning to disappear. The absent-minded parent hands the thief his money and asks him to keep it for him. Other members of the family confide in the thief the whereabouts of their valuables. Just as the two thieves have gotten everything in the house together and are making ready for their escape, a capitalist, who demands certain stock which he had given to the absent-minded parent as collateral for a loan, enters. The stock cannot be found, the capitalist's money disappears and he threatens punishment for everybody, and goes out in search of a warrant. The officers enter with a warrant; the warrant is stolen, then deposited carefully in the absent-minded one's pocket. The officers, waiting for another warrant, hold the household while the thieves are trying to escape. The kleptomaniac tries to avoid the consequences of his innocent depredations, and his wife tries to find out what the absent-minded one has concealed about his person. The money is eventually found in possession of the minister, the thieves hold up the whole party at the point of a pistol, and in conclusion the absent-minded parent re-

enters with all the booty which he, single-handed, has recovered.

"The idea of introducing into a respectable household thieves masquerading under the guise of respectability for the purpose of plunder is also old. This appeared in the play 'Black Birds.' The court has been furnished with a copy of this composition. There two clever confidence operators scheme a plot to extort money from a rich Detroit family. Under false names, they become guests of their victims, and employ an agent for effecting a marriage between the daughter of the host and a titled gentleman (one of the schemers). After an interview with a religious old grandmother, one of the schemers is conscience stricken. She reforms and assists her confederate, with whom she is in love, to escape from the police, who are about to arrest him for a crime committed in London.

"In 'Secret Strings,' staged in New York in December, 1914, the leading lady associates with a band of crooks, who plot to rob a countess of her magnificent jewels, and in the moment of triumph is surprised by a drawn revolver, and simultaneously the count and countess reveal themselves to be two noted detectives, who have been playing the parts assigned them to lure and arrest the famous criminal of whose intentions they have been fully forewarned. The leading lady, however, makes her escape by a trick in disarming the chief detective. She then is able to look forward in expectation of a life of happiness with the man she

loves. Thieves and police officers have been staged together in hundreds of plays. It was well illustrated in recent years in a most successful drama, 'Within the Law.'

"There is an important distinction between copyrights and patents. Letters patent give a monopoly to make, vend, and use, while copyright does not give an exclusive right to use. Copyright protection is extended to authors, mainly with a view to inducing them to give their ideas to the public, so that they may be added to the intellectual store, accessible to the people, and that they may be used for the intellectual advancement of mankind. It was well put by Lord Mansfield in *Sayre v. Moore* (I East, 361), when he said:

" 'We must take care to guard against two extremes equally prejudicial: The one that men of ability, who have employed their time for the service of the community, may not be deprived of their just merits and the reward of their ingenuity and labor; the other, that the world may not be deprived of improvements, nor the progress of the arts be retarded. The act that secures copyright to authors guards against the piracy of the words and sentiments, but it does not prohibit writing on the same subject.' "

"An author may have no monopoly upon any theory propounded by him, or in the speculations by which he has supported it, nor even in the use of the published results of his own observations. *Baker v. Selden* (101 U.S. 99, 25 L. Ed. 841); *Bauer v. O'Donnell* (229

U.S. 1, 33 Sup. Ct. 616, 57 L. Ed. 1041, 50 L.R.A. [N.S.] 1185, Ann. Cas. 1915A, 150). In *Chatterton v. Cave* (3 App. Cas. 483), Lord Blackburn said:

" 'An idea may be taken from a drama and used in forming another, without the representation of the second being a representation of any part of the first. For example, I have no doubt that Sheridan, in composing 'The Critic,' took the idea from 'The Rehearsal'; but I think it would be an abuse of language to say that those who represent 'The Critic' represent 'The Rehearsal' or any part thereof; and if it were left to me to find the fact, I should, without hesitation, find that they did not.' "

"The resemblances between the two dramatic compositions, I am of the opinion, are minor instances and are not important. The copyright cannot protect the fundamental plot, which is common property, as was pointed out above, long before the story was written. It will, of course, protect the author, who adds elements of literary value to the old plot; but it will not prohibit the presentation by some one else of the same old plot without the particular embellishments. *London v. Biograph,* (231 Fed. 696, 145 C.C.A. 582).

"(3) Upon careful reading of both manuscripts, I can find no copy or intimation, plot, scene, dialogue, sentiment, or characters, aside from the general features and subjects, which are pointed out in the above as clearly open to common use. The court should be particularly hesitant about granting a preliminary in-

junction after months of delay, and where it appears, by the affidavits of the defendants, that they did not know of the existence of the plaintiffs' manuscript until the commencement of this suit."

. . . . . .

The foregoing cases have been set forth in minute detail, inasmuch as they serve as well, if not more effectively, than any illustrative cases at the writer's command to demonstrate the difficulty our courts experience in ascertaining the constituent elements of a play. The test of piracy or infringement adopted by our courts, as well as an analysis of the respective manuscripts referred to in the opinions of Judges Knox and Manton, according to the Algebraic Formula, will be submitted in a subsequent chapter.

The theater and its entourage have debated throughout the centuries, always without guiding star or compass, the merits and demerits, as well as the component elements of particular plays. It is doubtful if the constituent elements of a play have been stated with greater accuracy by any authority than is found in "The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," by Price. At page 11 Mr. Price says that the analysis of a play consists of proposition, plot, unity, sequence, cause and effect. At page 17 he says: "Among the principles that will be treated separately are: Theme, Material, Conditions Precedent, Proposition, Plot, Division into Acts, Division into Scenes, Action, Unity, Sequence, Cause and Effect, Mere Life, Mere Story,

Mere Business, Mere Words, Indirection, Objectivity, The Unexpected, Preparation, The Self-explanatory, Compulsion, Facts, The Necessary and the Unnecessary, Character, Dialogue, Exits and Entrances, Episode, Scenery, Detail, etc."

CHAPTER II

WHAT IS A PLAY?

THE Algebraic Formula of a play is:

(A) A basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the theme; plus

(B) Personified by character; plus

(C) Motivated through:

1. Crucible,
2. Conflict,
3. Complication and/or intrigue to ultimate
4. Crisis and
5. Climax; plus

(D) Progressed by narrative, plot or story; plus

(E) Compartmented by derivative situations; plus

(F) Dressed up by incidental detailed construction; plus

(G) The underlying idea orientated through its constituent elements as dramaturgically expressed; plus

(H) Articulated by words; plus

(I) Imagined with artistry—

Equals "X"—A PLAY.

In discussing this Formula the writer, in order to avoid repetition, will use the phrase "a basic emotion," intending to include either a *basic emotion* or "an element in or of a basic emotion."

"Personified by character" will, unless otherwise indicated, have relation solely to the *basic character*.

"Narrative, plot or story will be used interchangeably, the words being synonymous.

A situation, or a dramatic situation, will have relation solely to *derivative situations* as contradistinguished from a basic situation—the theme.

CHAPTER III

DISCOVERY OF THE ALGEBRAIC FORMULA

INQUIRY has often been made as to how the Algebraic Formula was discovered; or, in other words, its mental method of approach. Reasonable familiarity with literature dealing with the theater, systematic study of playwriting, trial of actions involving literary piracy and infringement, brought no comprehending thought as to what, in reality, constituted either a novel, a play, or a motion picture. Endeavor to write a play through a number of years, constant attendance at the theater, study of the theater in its broadest aspect, study of plays, brought no point of view as to what truly constituted a play. Hundreds of times the writer has taken mental inventory and propounded the question—*what is a play?* He could find no answer to the inquiry.

Every law suit tried within the experience of the writer of this volume (covering a period of thirty years) has resolved itself during the course of the trial into an issue in respect to common source, that is, public domain,—opportunity or accessibility on the part of the alleged infringer to secure the material of the alleged pirated play, points of parallel, chain of co-

incidences, invariably a resort to expert testimony (the expert reading the plays and undertaking to say, as a matter of expert knowledge, that the plays *were* or *were not* alike, the expert always introduced with more or less acclaim as to his prestige, knowledge, learning and capacity to fathom the deep and subtle researches of the drama).

In a recent case tried in the Federal Court, Southern District of New York (*Simonton v. Gordon*), Dr. Brander Matthews, when interrogated as to how *plagiarism* was detected, asserted that it was much like the lady in the Treasury Department—she examined or felt a bill and said that it *was* or *was not* a counterfeit.

Within the writer's experience in connection with piracy or infringement cases there is no record in court annals where the issue of piracy or infringement was considered and threshed out upon a scientific basis, that is to say, it has never been possible to find out in a court-room, any more than in a theater, what constituted a play. Shakespeare said—"The play's the thing," but what kind of a "thing" a play was, or is, so far as we have been able to ascertain, has not been definitely determined.

It is the writer's contention that, under the Algebraic Formula two or more plays may be paralleled, squared and plumbed, with the certainty of an engineer's T, so that the understanding mind may be able to say with absolute assurance that two or more plays *are* or *are not* the same.

It is the purpose of this volume, through exposition and analysis of plays and law cases, to demonstrate to the reader the basic conception and sequential evolutionary exposition of a play through the Algebraic Formula. It is the contention of the writer that A plus B plus C of the Algebraic Formula, when paralleled in two plays, proves infringement, even though the six other elements of the play may be more or less or altogether different.

In the contention that A plus B plus C constitutes infringement, it is not intended to assert that C-2, C-3 and C-4 must be literally alike; if it be apparent that C-2, C-3 and C-4 are dramatically twisted to avoid infringement, or that certain characters or derivative situations may have been added or subtracted without substantially affecting the organic structure of the play, the culprit should not be absolved.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONCEPTION OF A PLAY

A PLAY must be conceived in the crucible of *life*. A play should not be born unless its purpose is either to entertain or instruct in the way of life. This volume is not intended to deal with mere entertainment. We wish to emphasize that what is here written is limited solely to a definitive play.

Various writers upon the drama, the art of the theater, the technique of playwriting, and kindred subjects, dilate at length upon the essentials of drama—its constituency—and invariably end in the common and never-failing discussion as to whether it is theme, plot, character or dialogue which really constitutes drama and proves most interesting to an audience. Our contention is—that which interests an audience in the greatest degree is the orientation of an idea emotionally expressed in the personification of characters made the vehicle (directly or indirectly) of the animate or inanimate thing in solution.

The chief essential in drama is that it be a *real play*. The Algebraic Formula defines with certainty, in logical sequence, the constituent elements of a play.

In order to have a *real play* there must be a point

of initiation. There must be a causative sequence, consecutiveness, unity, consistency and definitive visualization. It is confusing to say that any specific element is most vital.

The formula of a good play is not, as has been stated, from emotion to emotion. The formula of a good play is emotion pitted against emotion. Craftsmanship produces drama in the degree that the author has capacity to understand and express the nine constituent elements of the organic structure contained in the Algebraic Formula.

It is a fascinating thing to read the various criticisms written and published on playwriting and the drama and to endeavor to use these criticisms in examining or analyzing a play.

That which is done sub-consciously and instinctively may be perfect; nevertheless, without some standard of comparison—some rule or law—defies analysis. Practically every criticism written is confusing, by reason of the fact that *theme* is confused with *plot; theme* and/or *plot* confused with *orientation; character* confused with *theme, plot* or *orientation.*

In Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," Voltaire is quoted at page 278 as follows:

" 'To attain to M. Racine's perfection in writing, a man must be possessed of his genius, and take as much pains as he did in finishing his works. What apprehensions must I be then under, who, born with slender parts, and continually afflicted with diseases, have

neither an imagination to create many beauties, nor the liberty to correct my faults by constant labor and study. I am fully convinced of the many errors in the intrigue of this play, as well as in the diction. I should have corrected some, if the edition could have been retarded; but many must still have remained. There are certain limits in every art which we cannot go beyond. We are stopped by the weakness of our own talents. We spy perfection at a distance, and make but vain efforts to attain it.' "

If Voltaire suffered from these conflicting emotions, the reader may have some conception of the writer's agony, duly conscious of the seemingly insuperable problem; notwithstanding, in a humble spirit, he offers the Algebraic Formula as the organic structure of a scientific play, whereby the constituent elements of a play may be segregated and analyzed. Whether the Algebraic Formula *may* or *may not* be helpful to craftsmen in playwriting is an individual problem.

Is it reasonable to assume that the greatest difficulty in playwriting is due to the fact that plays are written sub-consciously and instinctively? Playwrights not having a definite understanding of what they are undertaking or endeavoring to do naturally write vagrant plays. When a seasoned playwright, or the humble tyro says, as Mr. Baker writes ("Dramatic Technique," page 93)—"It is no use. My characters will not give me a plot"—does the craftsman understand the use or purpose of characters in a play? Nondescript

characters, or unreal characters, will not give a plot or story. A play must be evolved from a basic situation, and if so renowned a writer as Mr. Polti does not understand the difference between a *basic* and a *derivative* situation, we may readily sense the most prolific cause of failure.

CHAPTER V

THE BASIC EMOTION, OR ELEMENT IN OR OF A BASIC EMOTION, CONSTITUTING THE THEME

WHERE does a play begin? What is the initiative point of concept? What is the organic structure? What are the constituent elements? Where does the play go?

It is our contention that the point of origin or initiative of a play is a basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the theme. Schiller is quoted in Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 322, as follows: " 'The final aim to which all the laws tend is called the *end* of any style of poetry. The means by which it attains this are its form. The end and form are, therefore, closely related. The form is determined by the end, and when the form is well observed the end is generally attained. Each kind of poetry having a special end must have a distinguishing form. What it exclusively produces it does in virtue of this special nature it possesses. The end of tragedy is emotion; . . .' "

Schiller understood that the design and purpose of a play was accomplished through its form (formula).

Mr. W. T. Price says ("The Analysis of Play Con-

struction and Dramatic Principle," page 8): "The drama or its material embraces every emotion felt by any human being."

At page 19 he says: "The Theme of a play is the general subject, which holds throughout, but which reduced to a specific form becomes the basis of the play. There must be one leading and controlling Theme, . . ."

Prof. B. Roland Lewis says ("The Technique of the One-Act Play," page 37): "The practical dramatist, then, who desires to become a popular playwright, in the proper acceptation of the term, must appeal to the fundamental emotions of the group; that is, to the basic and vital emotions of the human race. Love, devotion, sacrifice, fidelity to a trust, patriotism, duty, anger, jealousy, revenge, love of home, love of family, love of woman, maternity and motherhood,—these are some of the motives which impel men and woman to struggle and to attain."

Again, at page 39 he says: "The dramatist must realize that he is not writing to provoke mental functioning but to stimulate emotional response."

At page 45 he says: "What it (theater audience) desires—though it is not always really conscious of it —is to have its emotions played upon."

At page 49 he says: "A rich story of life, with deep passion and emotion as the motive, told in objective, concrete action is the type of play that appeals to a present-day audience; . . ."

Again, at page 61: "Being as generously sympathetic with life as he is, the playwright lives in the very emotions and personalities of his characters. He can feel, to a large degree, the torture of fear, the pangs of remorse, the rancor of jealousy, the fervor of love and affection, the zeal of enthusiasm, the bitterness of sorrow. He can be as vain as the egotist, as pompous as the shallow-minded, as demure and modest as the shy maiden, as quarrelsome as a selfish youngster who insists upon playing the game of life unfairly. As a sound genetic psychologist, he understands human motives and can make his characters act in semblance of genuinely human beings."

At page 62: "The practical dramatist is obliged so to appeal to his spectators that they will, in large measure, lose their consciousness of self in the consciousness of the emotional values of the play."

At page 76: "Drama especially must arouse the powers of attention and provoke mental and emotional response in the minds and hearts of the audience."

At page 83: "Not to have a definite theme in a play means that it violates a fundamental psychological law."

Page 85: ". . . . a play that deliberately sets out to produce a given emotional effect is very likely to be held by its very intent to organic oneness."

Page 112: "The basic thing in human life is emotion, not thought."

Mr. Bernard Shaw, in "Fanny's First Play," has the

critic Trotter say: "Pooh! Cambridge! If you had been educated at Oxford, you would know that the definition of a play has been settled exactly and scientifically for two thousand two hundred and sixty years."

We therefore contend that, in order to have dramatic unity, a play must be pivoted logically upon a basic emotion, which should constitute the primary and fundamental theme of the play.

Much confusion exists in respect to the word "emotion;" dictionary definitions are more or less unsatisfactory; books on psychology do not offer much light. Eliminate any and every emotion, and any and every element in or of an emotion, from the human entity and nothing whatever would remain but a husk—an inarticulate and functionless being. Conceive of yourself as devoid of ambition, desire, fear, pity, love, hate, order, regularity—the human race would perish. Emotion, or the elements in or of an emotion, constitute the basic things in life. Emotion is life. Life is emotion. Therefore, emotion is drama. Drama is emotion. The basic emotions constitute the organic and inherent structure of life—planted in the human spirit they are eternal, irrefutable and incapable of destruction. If the emotions may not be destroyed, the *result* of emotions may not be destroyed.

Every activity of man radiates from and/or has its being, either directly or indirectly, in an emotion. The most common activities of human beings, either mental or physical, may be traced, directly or indirectly, to an

emotion, or an element in or of an emotion. Mr. Darwin says ("Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals," page 13): "In the first place, to observe infants; for they exhibit many emotions, as 'Sir C. Bell remarks "with extraordinary force." ' "

In "Tertium Organum," P. D. Ouspensky said, at page 217: "In reality in the soul of man nothing exists save emotions. And the soul life of man is either a struggle or a harmonious adjustment between different emotions. Spinoza saw this quite clearly when he said that emotion can be mastered only by another more powerful emotion, and by *nothing else.* Reason, will, feeling, duty, faith, spirituality, mastering some other emotion, can conquer only by force of the *emotional element* contained in them. The ascetic who kills all desires and passions in himself, kills them by the desire for salvation. A man renouncing all the pleasures of the world, renounces them because of the delight of sacrifice, of renunciation. A soldier dying at his post through his *sense of duty* or habit of obedience, does so because the emotion of *devotion,* or *faithfulness,* is more powerful in him than all other things. A man whose moral sense prompts him to overcome passion in himself, does so because the moral sense (i. e., emotion) is more powerful than all his other feelings, other emotions.

Again, at page 218: "Will is the resultant of desires. We call that man *strong-willed* in whom the *will* proceeds on definite lines, without turning aside;

and we call that man weak-willed in whom the line of the will takes a zig-zag course, turning aside here or there under the influence of every new desire. But this does not mean that *will* and *desire* are something opposite; quite the reverse, they are one and the same, because the will is composed of desires."

What is an emotion? It is a psychic echo. It is the result of something projected, either externally or internally, into human consciousness. The thing projected, either mental or physical, creates a psychic echo, for example: "A" visions a painting; the painting visualizes *anger;* the idea of anger as visualized in the painting is projected into the consciousness of "A"; the psychic echo is the basic emotion *anger.* Again, "A" visions a painting visualizing joy. The idea of *joy* as visualized in the painting is projected in the consciousness of "A." The psychic echo is the emotion *joy.* "A" awakens; his conscious or sub-conscious thought projects a pending activity. The psychic echo will be the emotion underlying the thought. This postulate is submitted to the reader for examination and practice. Without limitation, and in every instance, the result is certain. Ouspensky, in "Tertium Organum," at page 219 says: "To understand the psychology of *Play,* it is necessary to experience the emotions of the player; to understand the psychology of *the hunt,* it is necessary to experience the emotions of the hunter; the psychology of a man in love is in-

comprehensible to him who is indifferent; the state of mind of Archimedes when he jumped out of the bath tub is incomprehensible to the staid citizen, who would look on such a performance as a sign of insanity; the feelings of the globe-trotter, delightedly breathing in the sea air and sweeping with his eyes the wide horizon, is incomprehensible to the sedentary stay-at-home. The feeling of a believer is incomprehensible to an unbeliever, and to a believer the feeling of an unbeliever is quite as strange. Men understand one another so imperfectly because they live always by *different* emotions. And when they feel similar emotions simultaneously, then and then only do they understand one another."

. . . . . .

"Emotions are the stained-glass windows of the soul; colored glasses through which the soul looks at the world. Each such glass assists in finding in the contemplated object the same or similar colors, but it also prevents the finding of opposite ones."

The logic of all this is significant in the organic structure of a play. A play, being a cross-section of life, must necessarily be pivoted upon a basic emotion. This is what constitutes the theme of the play. If the playwright projects from the stage to the audience the basic emotion underlying his play, the psychic echo in the audience must inevitably be that of the basic emotion projected, provided the auditor have in his con-

sciousness what Ouspensky is pleased to characterize as experience in relation to the emotions of the player.

Effort has been made for many centuries to state the basic dramaturgical situations. Mr. Polti undertook, in a treatise entitled "The Thirty-Six Dramatic Situations" to catalogue all the possible dramatic situations that the relations of life offer. He said that he had read and analyzed thousands of plays and resolved their basic story material into fundamental categories. It is quite evident, however, that Mr. Polti had no true understanding of the basic dramaturgical situations. Few who have written upon the theater or the technique of the drama have understood the dramaturgical theme. Of the thirty-six so-called dramaturgical situations or themes presented in Mr. Polti's book, the far greater number are purely derivative situations. Mr. Polti's book is a confusing treatise. He claims, among other things, that *murder* is a basic dramaturgical situation. This is incorrect. Murder is a derivative situation. As a direct or indirect result of a basic emotion, such as love, jealousy, revenge or hate, one may commit murder. Mr. Polti states that *adultery* is a basic dramaturgical situation. Adultery is a derivative situation; it may result from any one or more of a number of basic emotions.

The basic dramaturgical situations from which plays may be written are those compassed by the gamut of human emotions. Without undertaking to catalogue all human emotions, or the elements in or of emotions

(for this is truly beyond the ken of mortal mind), we submit a compilation which may be of great assistance in formulating character, as follows:

A

Affection	Admiration	Anger	Avarice
Abstraction	Amusement	Agony	Anxiety
Amorousness	Assurance	Adventure	Apprehension
Astonishment	Amazement	Assiduousness	Accuracy
Authenticity	Ambition	Aspiration	Aggressiveness
Artistry	Achievement	Abusiveness	Acrimonious
Austerity	Artfulness	Arrogance	Alchemistry
Allurement	Attraction	Ancientness	Antiquarian
Abasement	Abandoned	Abnormality	Aberrant
Adaptability	Adjustment	Arrangement	Attenuation
Audacity	Accomplishment	Aristocracy	Awkwardness
Anguish	Accommodation		

B

Blandishment	Buffoonery	Bribery	Bigotry
Bohemianism	Burlesquing	Brightness	Bewilderment
Bemuddled	Brutality	Bullying	Bantering
Bravery	Borrowing	Backsliding	Brigandry
Banditry	Boldness	Benevolence	Bragging
Besmirch	Bluestocking	Bookish	Betrayal
Backbiting	Brazenness		

C

Constancy	Covetousness	Calmness	Cheerfulness
Conviviality	Circumlocution	Circumvention	Craftiness

Cunning	Cheating	Conceit	Conscience
Complacency	Conquest	Chivalry	Confusion
Combativeness	Competition	Charity	Compassion
Consideration	Contempt	Contumely	Crusading
Consecutiveness	Classification	Consciousness	Chastity
Cravenness	Creative	Chimerical	Cubistic
Conquerer	Champion	Comedy	Cynical
Comprehension	Cleverness	Canny	Chaotic
Circumspection	Carefulness	Churlishness	Chiding
Coarseness	Chance	Cajolery	Coquetry
Caprice	Captivating	Conspiracy	Confederacy
Concertive	Combination	Collusive	Combining
Cabalism	Curiosity	Carelessness	Courtesanry
Conjectural	Compromise	Conformable	Cupidity
Calumny	Counterfeiting	Cowardice	Clumsiness
Crushed	Compressed	Cruelty	Complaining

D

Devotion	Discomfort	Despair	Distress
Dejection	Disappointment	Degeneracy	Deception
Daring	Despotism	Deceit	Dread
Defiance	Disputation	Disgust	Disdain
Despicableness	Determination	Decision	Desire
Descriptiveness	Dreamy	Dilettantism	Derision
Doubt	Dubiousness	Disbelief	Distrust
Distraction	Disconcert	Demoralized	Dumfounded
Dishonor	Delusion	Devotional	Discretion
Domineering	Diplomacy	Degradation	Dissipation
Debauchery	Discursiveness	Drollery	Disgrace
Discredited	Disagreeable	Disrepute	Dignity
Distinction	Deceive	Depressed	Duped
Dejection	Doctrinaire	Disposing	Dishonesty

Duplicating	Decrepit	Desperation	Dauntless
Downtrodden	Disguise	Devoid	

E

Effacement	Endurance	Enjoyment	Egotism
Enthusiasm	Eccentricity	Entanglement	Embarrassment
Equivocal	Emulation	Effeminacy	Extravagance
Erraticism	Envy	Eagerness	Eloquence
Exaltation	Enigmatical	Exhaustion	

F

Friendship	Fondness	Forgiveness	Faithfulness
Fidelity	Fury	Frightfulness	Fictional
Fable	Fantastic	Faddism	Fear
Firmness	Forcefulness	Fancifulness	Futuristic
Fulfilment	Flattery	Fatuitous	Freethinking
Fanaticism	Freedom	Fickleness	Fluency
Farcical	Forsaken	Forlorn	Flouted
Frugality	Faintness	Feebleness	Frailty
Forwarding	Faultfinding		

G

Generosity	Greed	Gayety	Guilt
Glorification	Gruesomeness	Garrulous	Godliness
Grumbling	Gambling	Gallantry	Guileless
Gluttonness			

H

Hospitality	Hate	Heartlessness	Humbleness
Humiliation	Humility	Happiness	Helplessness

Haughtiness	Horror	Hallucination	Hypochondriac
Hysteria	Honor	Honesty	Hypocrisy
Humor	Holiness	Hardness	Harshness
Headstrong	Hazarding	Heedlessness	Hastiness
Harlotism	Hoaxed	Hypothetical	Homeliness
Hardihood	Hesitancy	Healing	Hilarity

I

Ill-Temper	Indignation	Irascibleness
Innocence	Impotence	Immorality
Impurity	Immodesty	Intrigue
Inflation	Invention	Idealism
Illusion	Impressionableness	Irresponsibility
Irony	Ignominiousness	Inflexibility
Introspection	Integrity	Immaculateness
Imagination	Impressionist	Intrepidity
Intolerance	Intellectuality	Insight
Intuition	Incertitude	Incredulity
Indecision	Impudence	Impious
Inhumanity	Insolence	Imperiousness
Independence	Inveigling	Impertinence
Insinuating	Infatuation	Impassioned
Indefiniteness	Indeterminate	Imprudence
Insecurity	Inquisitiveness	Inquisitorial
Impulsiveness	Improvidence	Infamy
Iniquity	Imitation	Idleness
Indolence	Inertness	Infirmity
Imbecility	Ingratitude	

J

Jealousy	Joy	Joviality	Justice
Jumbled	Judiciousness	Jollying	Jesting
Joking	Jocularity		

K

Kindness Keenness Knavery

L

Love	Loyalty	Lust	Lying
Litigiousness	Laziness	Loquacious	Loftiness
Lampooning	Learned	Lucidity	Libertine
Licentiousness	Luring	Lordliness	Lamentation
Luxuriousness			

M

Mercy	Miserliness	Modesty	Meditation
Morbidness	Melancholy	Moroseness	Mysticism
Misanthropy	Martyrdom	Morality	Mastery
Majesty	Mockery	Misconception	Madness
Machination	Mystification	Malevolence	Maturity
Malice	Mania	Misery	Mimicking
Malicious	Merrymaking	Mystery	

N

Notional Needy Neatness Nobility
Naturalness

O

Optimism	Occultism	Obstinacy	Order
Orthodox	Old-Fashioned	Obsolete	Odium
Ostentation	Oppression	Overburdened	Offending

P

Perfidy	Parasitical	Placidity	Patience
Penance	Pride	Prudishness	Priggery
Pretentiousness	Picturesque	Perplexity	Puzzled
Pity	Precision	Piety	Purity
Poetical	Protection	Patriotism	Perception
Prudence	Perspicuity	Puritanical	Pitilessness
Plotting	Perfidiousness	Profligacy	Presumption
Precariousness	Pedantic	Pessimism	Politeness
Philosophical	Pliable	Prodigality	Pusillanimous
Poltroonery	Plainness	Persecution	Pleasure
Passion	Protestation		

Q

Quickness	Quackery	Questioning	Quizzical

R

Repression	Reticence	Restlessness	Romance
Rivalry	Resistance	Rebellion	Resentment
Regularity	Reflection	Retrospection	Reverence
Ridicule	Receptive	Religion	Religious
Reproving	Rudeness	Risking	Rakery
Ribaldry	Regal	Rascality	Regardful
Reminding	Revenge	Reformation	Resignation

S

Simplicity	Sincerity	Sorrow	Suffering
Sadness	Sex	Sensuousness	Seductiveness
Silence	Subterfuge	Superiority	Sneering

Sacrifice	Selfishness	Suspension	Shyness
Suspicious	Submission	Snobbery	Style
Sufficiency	Superstition	Surprise	Sulkiness
Spiritualism	Sympathy	Scorn	Shame
Sarcasm	Stoicism	Spirituality	Scrupulousness
Satire	Sardonic	Sagacity	Sensitive
Shrewdness	Subtleness	Skepticism	Stupidity
Stupefied	Skeptic	Soothsayer	Scolding
Savagery	Severity	Stubborn	Speculation
Self-Importance	Scrutinizing	Sorcery	Sporting
Scandal	Sinning	Spying	Sportive
Sumptuousness	Sluggishness	Shiftlessness	Slothness
Squalidness	Simpleness	Shaky	Spineless
Senility	Shrewishness	Securing	Security
Solemnity			

T

Tenderness	Tyranny	Trickery	Tortuousness
Terror	Tenacity	Truth	Triumphant
Tormenting	Thriftlessness	Teasing	Transgression
Trespassing	Theoretic	Tractable	Treachery
Termagant	Trouble		

U

Utopianism	Unyielding	Uprightness	Understanding
Uncertainty	Undecided	Uncivility	Unkindness
Ungentleness	Unreasonable	Unreasoning	Unbecoming
Unfaithfulness	Unnatural	Unloved	Unloving
Ungratefulness	Untidiness	Unaffected	Unhappiness
Unsuspecting	Unshaken	Unscrupulousness	
Unsophisticated	Unthankfulness	Usurpation	

V

Violence	Veneration	Vanity	Veracity
Virtue	Virginity	Visionary	Vice
Vicious	Victory	Vindictiveness	Voluptuousness
Venturesome	Vagueness	Volubility	Victimized
Vanquished	Versatility	Vulgarity	Virago
Vixen	Vagabondage		

W

Wanderlust	Waggery	Wishing	Witticism
Weakness	Wagering	Wheedling	Wasting
Wrong-Doing	Wantonness	Worry	

X

Y

Yearning

Z

Zealotry

CHAPTER VI

THE THEME OF THE PLAY CONTINUED

We maintain that the *theme* of a play is the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, dominating the play—necessarily the dominant emotion of the basic character.

In Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," Lodovico Castelvetro is quoted as follows, page 64: " 'It was Aristotle's opinion that the plot of tragedy and comedy ought to comprise one action only, or two whose interdependence makes them one, and ought rather to concern one person than a race of people.' "

Again, at page 65: " 'The plot of drama should necessarily comprise one action of one person, or two, interdependent on each other.' "

In the same book John Dryden is quoted at page 185 as follows: " 'But I return again to the French writers, who, as I have said, do not burden themselves too much with plot, which has been reproached to them by an ingenious person of our nation as a fault; for, he says, they commonly make but one person considerable in a play; they dwell on him, and his concernments, while the rest of the persons are only subservient to set him off.' "

At page 190: " 'There is another part of Lisideius his discourse, in which he rather excused our neighbors than commended them; that is, for aiming only to make one person considerable in their plays. 'Tis very true what he has urged, that one character in all plays, even without the poet's care, will have advantage of all the others; and that the design of the whole drama will chiefly depend on it. But this hinders not that there may be more shining characters in the play; many persons of a second magnitude, nay, some so very near, so almost equal to the first, that greatness may be opposed to greatness, and all the persons be made considerable, not only by their quality, but their action. 'Tis evident that the more the persons are, the greater will be the variety of the plot. If then the parts are managed so regularly, that the beauty of the whole be kept entire, and that the variety become not a perplexed and confused mass of accidents, you will find it infinitely pleasing to be led in a labyrinth of design, where you see some of your way before you, yet discern not the end till you arrive at it. And that all this is practicable.' "

In the same book Gustav Freytag is quoted as follows, page 358: " 'The dramatic includes those emotions of the soul which steel themselves to will, and to do, and those emotions of the soul which are aroused by a deed or course of action; also the inner processes which man experiences from the first glow of perception to passionate desire and action, as well as the in-

fluences which one's own and others' deeds exert upon the soul; also the rushing forth of will power from the depths of man's soul toward the external world, and the influx of fashioning influences from the outer world into man's inmost being; also the coming into being of a deed, and its consequences on the human soul.

" 'An action in itself is not dramatic. Passionate feeling in itself is not dramatic. Not the presentation of a passion for itself, but of a passion which leads to action is the business of dramatic art; not the presentation of an event for itself, but for its effect on a human soul, is the dramatist's mission. The exposition of passionate emotions as such, is in the province of the lyric poet; the depicting of thrilling events is the task of the epic poet.' "

Mr. Archer says ("Play-Making," page 16): " 'Theme' may mean either of two things: either the subject of a play, or its story."

Theme is the *subject* of a play, but it is not the *story*. The story is the plot, the narrative, the action. Mr. Archer confuses theme, plot and orientation. At page 19 ("Play-Making") he says: "The theme may sometimes be, not an idea, an abstraction or a principle, but rather an environment, a social phenomenon of one sort or another." Each of these suggestions presents *orientation*—not *theme*.

Mr. Wilde ("The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play") devotes Chapter VIII. to the subject of *theme*. At page 61 he says: "A theme is a declarative state-

ment, possessing some degree of truth and couched in broad, general terms. 'Man is naturally polygamous.' 'War is terrible.' 'Woman suffrage is desirable.' " Each of these declarative statements suggests a point of *orientation*, but do not constitute *theme*. Let us consider the declarative statement "War is terrible." This point of orientation may be used in direct relation to the theme or basic emotion *ambition*. A play upon the subject of ambition, orientated from the idea "War is terrible," would necessarily have as its crucible *war*. The play "What Price Glory" has as its point of orientation "War is terrible." The theme, however, of "What Price Glory" is irony; the crucible is war. This play was doubtless written sub-consciously and instinctively.

Mr. Clayton Hamilton ("Studies in Stagecraft," page 154) says: "The soul of a play is its theme, and the body of a play is its story. A play may have a great theme and an inadequate story, or an interesting story and scarcely any theme at all; it may be a noble-minded hunch-back or a shallow-pated Prince Charming; but only a few great plays reveal profound, important themes beneath the lineaments of engaging and enthralling stories.

"By the theme of a play is meant some principle, or truth, of human life—such a truth as might be formulated critically in an abstract and general proposition —which the dramatist contrives to convey concretely to his auditors through the particular medium of his story. Thus, the theme of 'Ghosts' is that the sins of

the fathers are visited on the children, and the theme of 'The Pigeon' is that the wild spirits and the tame spirits of the world can never understand each other."

Mr. Hamilton in the above statement mistakes *orientation* for *theme*. The theme of "Ghosts" is *dread*. It is orientated from the idea that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children. The theme of "The Pigeon" is *charity*. The true orientation of "The Pigeon" is whether or not it is well to throw pearls before swine. The general subject which holds throughout the play "The Pigeon" is *charity*, personified in the character of Christopher Wellwyn. This character is very much a counterpart of the character of Gilchrist in Channing Pollock's play "The Fool." The two plays, however, have an entirely different theme. The theme of "The Fool" is *sacrifice*. The distinction may be readily traced and drawn by a careful reading of the two plays. In "The Pigeon" Wellwyn was so truly dominated metaphysically and psychologically that he could not resist the inclination to give to the undeserving everything that he had, even though it meant penury to himself and daughter Ann. The daughter Ann personifies or characterizes *protest*. The other secondary characters demonstrate that the theme of charity holds throughout. The woman, Mrs. Megan, personifies *wantonness;* her husband personifies *gambling*. Ferrand, the alien, personifies *vagabondage;* Timpson, the cabman, *desire for drink*. These four characters, constituting parasites taking advantage

of Wellwyn's *charity*, present the age-old question of whether or not charity of this character is not misplaced.

The theme of "Ghosts" is *dread*, personified in the basic character Oswald. The play is orientated from the idea that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children. Oswald Alving enters the play about the middle of the first act. Oswald describes himself as "the prodigal son." At the end of the first act there comes a noise from the dining-room and these words are heard:

> REGINA [*sharply, but in a whisper*]. Oswald! Take care! are you mad? Let me go!

Mrs. Alving is in terror and says:

> Ghosts! The couple from the conservatory—risen again!

Practically the whole of Mrs. Alving's dialogue discloses *dread*. The crucible of "Ghosts" is heritage. In the course of the second act Oswald Alving discloses his basic emotion as *dread*. He begins to tell his story to his mother. Oswald says:

> Mother, my mind is broken down—ruined—I shall never be able to work again! [*With his hands before his face, he buries his head in her lap, and breaks into bitter sobbing.*]

Mrs. Alving says:

> [*White and trembling*] Oswald, look at me! No, no; it's not true.

Oswald:

[*Looks up with despair in his eyes*]. Never to be able to work again! . . . A living death! Mother, can you imagine anything so horrible?

Thereupon Oswald discloses to his mother his inheritance. He learned the truth from a doctor in Paris. The doctor had said to Oswald:

There has been something worm-eaten in you from your birth.

Oswald tells his mother the doctor had said to him:

The sins of the fathers are visited upon the children.

Oswald speaks of gnawing thoughts—it is so dark —the ceaseless rain—he wants to drink champagne; then he discloses in truth his basic emotion. Oswald says:

But it's all the torment, the gnawing remorse—and then, the great killing dread. Oh—that awful dread!

Mrs. Alving [*walking after him*]:

Dread? What dread? What do you mean?

Oswald:

Oh, you mustn't ask me any more. I don't know. I can't describe it.

In Act III. Oswald says:

Everything will burn. All that recalls father's memory is doomed. Here am I, too, burning down.

Again Oswald says:

Oh, do shut all the doors! This killing dread——

Again Oswald says:

. . . who will relieve me of the dread?

He again says:

. . . When I came to know the state I had been in, then the dread descended upon me, raging and raving; and so I set off home to you as fast as I could.

Again he says:

Yes—it's so indescribably loathsome, you know. Oh, if it had only been an ordinary mortal disease—! For I'm not so afraid of death—though I should like to live as long as I can.

Mrs. Alving says:

Yes, yes, Oswald, you must!

Oswald says:

But this is so unutterly loathsome. To become a little baby again! To have to be fed! To have to—Oh, it's not to be spoken of!

Again Oswald says to his mother:

Have you a mother's heart for me—and yet can see me suffer from this unutterable dread?

Mr. Charlton Andrews, in his book entitled "The Technique of Playwriting," Chapter II, page 9 says:

"Directions for writing plays usually commence with the choice of a theme. . . ."

He says—"The theme of 'Macbeth,' for instance, may be thus stated: A man of high position is led to commit a great crime to attain his ambition.

"To maintain his position he is led to other crimes.

"Finally, gaining no enjoyment from the attainment of his ambition, he is put to death by forces aroused by his own crimes."

This analysis of "Macbeth" is *orientation;* it is not *theme.* The basic emotion of "Macbeth" is *ambition.* Mr. Andrews invariably mistakes *plot* and/or *orientation* for *theme.*

It is difficult to determine from "The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," by Price, pages 19–25, whether he glimpsed the important fact that the theme of a play is its basic and dominant emotion. Mr. Price's statement of the subject is not as confusing as those of many other authors, but he often confuses *theme* with *orientation.*

Prof. B. Roland Lewis, in his "The Technique of the One-Act Play," in Chapter IV. discusses the dramatic value of a theme. Albeit, he invariably confuses *orientation* for *theme.* Prof. Lewis says, at page 83: "Not to have a definite theme in a play means that it violates a fundamental psychological law."

Again, at pages 83 and 84, he says: "For structural reasons, if for no other, a theme and a definite intent on the part of the author are necessary to secure

that well-ordered unity so essential to a finished art product."

Again, at page 85 he says: ". . . whereas a play that deliberately sets out to produce a given emotional effect is very likely to be held by its very intent to organic oneness. It is highly desirable, then, for structural reasons, that the one-act play have a definite theme."

Nevertheless, throughout the discussion of *theme* in Prof. Lewis' book he confuses *orientation* for *theme.*

It is our contention that the theme of a play is its point of initiation. It is the primal cause of the play. The theme is the pivot upon which the whole play swings. It is like the green line in the subway telling the playwriting traveler, as well as the reader, where to go and how to go. The basic dramaturgical emotion or theme is not only the most important and vital element in the play and in playwriting, but it is a truism that must not be ignored. The theme is the fixed point of genesis and, unless scientifically and logically or instinctively and subconsciously developed, there will be either no play at all, or a play so confusing as to be uninteresting or impossible.

The basic emotion selected as the *theme* of the play must ever be the guiding compass by which the playwriting mariner secures and defines his longitude and latitude.

The conception of a play, that is, its *orientation,* may have its genesis in any one of a thousand points of view.

The playwright must, however, inevitably, by logical, scientific, subconscious or instinctive selection, definitely place the basic dramaturgical emotion from which the organic structure will be evolved and developed. Entertainment may be written in many and varied forms of more or less interest. Entertainment *may*, or *may not*, have box office value; but entertainment *is not* and *cannot* be a play, unless it has organic structure. There is as much difference between the basic *theme* of a play and its *plot* as there is between the compass and the North Pole. The North, or magnetic pole, controls the vibration and oscillation of the compass. The plot is synonymous with story and narrative. If the plot, story or narrative digresses or oscillates away from the basic primary dramaturgical emotion, the play will prove abortive; it may possess elements of entertainment, but it cannot be a logical play. The true basis of unity in a play is the play's perfect orientation to its basic dramaturgical emotion. The basic emotion constituting the theme must permeate the entire structure of the play, as will be more fully indicated in succeeding chapters.

The function of the theme is basic, organic and structural. Whatever idea the playwright may entertain as to the subject-matter of the play, from whatever point of view he may undertake to orientate, it is a fruitless and idle gesture to attempt the construction of the play without, in the first instance, either scientifically or subconsciously, establishing the basic dramaturgical

emotion constituting the theme. It is this basic emotion which must, with unerring certainty, dominate the play, and from which the play radiates and becomes articulate; it is this which gives unity and harmony to the play. Playwrights who do not construct their plays from this organic structural basis, either scientifically and logically or instinctively and subconsciously, as the case may be, do not write interesting or successful plays. One may linger a long time with a point of orientation (the idea from which the playwright proposes orientating his play); one may work assiduously upon many phases of the play, but his work will be in vain until he has established his basic and primary dramaturgical emotion and orientates the play from that initiatory point.

As a concrete example of the difficulties which the playwright encounters, even though he be a master-mind and a genius, there is no finer example than Mr. Bernard Shaw's "Fanny's First Play." Let us analyze this play from the basis of organic structure and it may be conclusively demonstrated that Mr. Shaw did not write a play in "Fanny's First Play":—

"Fanny's First Play" is a play within a play, or, an outer and an inner play. If we analyze the alleged play from the standpoint of the outer play, we have the basic emotion *faddism;* the basic character personifying faddism *Fanny;* the crucible *playwriting;* the elements of conflict the four critics, Fanny's father and Savoyard. These characters appear in the Prologue

and in the Epilogue; they do not appear in the inner play and the characters in the inner play have no prototype or counterpart of either Fanny, the critics, Fanny's father or Savoyard.

There is no *complication* between the characters in the outer play and there is no climax. The outer play contains no plot.

The *compartmented situations* are not dramatic.

There is no point of *orientation*—certainly not with the basic theme.

The *dialogue* in the Prologue and Epilogue has no part or specific relation to the basic emotion faddism.

There is no *artistry*.

If we consider "Fanny's First Play" from the standpoint of the inner play, treating the outer play as a mere shell or vehicle for the inner play, we have less organic structure.

If we take the characters in the inner play in the order in which they are introduced in the play we have: Mrs. Gilbey, personifying *placidity;* Juggins, personifying *disguise;* Dora, personifying *hilarity;* Mr. Knox, personifying *trouble;* Mrs. Knox, personifying *solemnity;* Margaret Knox, personifying *audacity;* Duvallet, the Frenchman, personifying *freedom;* Bobby Gilbey, personifying *deceit.*

It cannot be said that any one of the emotions in the inner play are made dominant so as to constitute a *theme* in the inner play; as a matter of fact, the inner play has no *theme;* there is no *basic character* in the

inner play. In the Epilogue the critic Gunn is made to say:

> Here you have a rotten old-fashioned domestic melodrama acted by the usual stage puppets.

It evidently was Mr. Shaw's idea that the crucible of the inner play is *the family;* but, as a matter of fact, there are no elements of conflict in the crucible that ever present complication, or that lead into any dramatic crisis, and there is no real dramatic climax.

The critic Gunn again says:

> The hero's a naval lieutenant. All melodramatic heroes are naval lieutenants.

As a matter of fact, this naval lieutenant (Duvallet), who personifies *freedom*, has no relation to the inner play; he is a married man; he is not the *basic character* in the inner play and he does not, in any way, constitute an element of an organic structure. The critic says:

> The heroine gets into trouble by defying the law. (If she didn't get into trouble, there'd be no drama) and plays for sympathy all the time as hard as she can.

Evidently Mr. Shaw considers Margaret Knox, whose basic emotion is *audacity*, as the heroine. If she is the heroine and intended to be the basic character in the play, certainly our hero, the naval lieutenant, should have had some relation to an organic structure, save

the mere undramatic incident of meeting her, taking her to a dance, and being her companion in a Magistrate's court.

Gunn says again:

> Her good old pious mother turns on her cruel father when he's going to put her out of the house, and says she'll go too.

Mrs. Knox, personifying *solemnity*, and Mr. Knox, personifying *trouble*, certainly are not dramatic characters in the sense that they constitute any part of a dramatic organic structure.

Gunn again says:

> Then there's the comic relief: the comic shopkeeper, the comic shopkeeper's wife, the comic footman who turns out to be a duke in disguise, . . .

Gilbey and his wife, personifying respectively *irascibility* and *placidity*, may be comic in Mr. Shaw's mind, but there is little in the dialogue which makes them comic. The duke, disguised as a footman, has an element of comedy, and if there be a hero, he would constitute the hero, for he marries the daughter.

The critic Gunn again says:

> . . . and the young scapegrace who gives the author his excuse for dragging in a fast young woman.

This fast young woman is Dora, personifying the basic emotion *hilarity*, but she is an irrelevant character, in so far as the play has any organic structure. Just

what relation Dora has to the family difficulties of either the Gilbeys or the Knoxes is difficult to determine.

Throughout this so-called play Mr. Shaw indulges in the thing that constitutes him the modern literary genius—sarcasm, irony and satire—directed against a false, decrepit and discredited social order. The outer play and the inner play lack unity and harmony; they are not correlated in any way; the *plot* of the inner play is thin (if it exists at all); the *compartmented situations* are without dramatic value for, as has been stated, there is no element of conflict, complication, crisis or climax that may be motivated from cause to effect.

In this so-called play, as in many others of Mr. Shaw's literary effusions, we have a Preface. If we analyze the Preface, it does not explain or elucidate the so-called play. If one labored until doomsday with the so-called characters in "Fanny's First Play" (outer and inner), one could not find a metaphysical or psychological basis for anything that was said or done by any character in the so-called play. If one examines the dialogue one finds the product of an essayist, a satirist, an iconoclast, an in and out philosopher, a word-juggler, but no semblance of playwriting structure. Mr. Shaw seems to realize this, for he has the critic Bannal say in the Epilogue:

> . . . But Shaw doesn't write his plays as plays. All he wants to do is to insult everybody all around and set us talking about him.

As evidence of Mr. Shaw's inability to appreciate, or unwillingness to follow the organic structure in a play, it is interesting to read his Preface or Introduction to three plays by Eugene Brieux (Brentano's, 1914). Mr. Shaw commends Mr. Brieux's three plays "Maternity," "The Three Daughters of Monsieur Dupont" and "Damaged Goods." At pages 22 and 23 of the Preface Mr. Shaw undertakes to state how to write a popular play and sets forth an alleged formula, all of which is trivial.

It is Mr. Shaw's conception that organic structure precludes virility and strength in playwriting. The three plays referred to by Mr. Shaw, written by Mr. Brieux, not only lack organic structure and dramatic value, but constitute didactic tracts. Each of these three plays might have been made strong, virile drama.

Let us examine the two versions of "Maternity," presented in this volume.—In the first version of "Maternity" it is difficult to locate a basic character. However, the second version evidences that Mr. Brieux intended Lucie Brignac as the basic character. In the first version Lucie Brignac personifies the basic emotion *sacrifice*. In the second version Lucie Brignac, Madeleine, Annette and Catherine personify the basic emotion of *injustice*. In the first version of "Maternity" organic structure is wholly lacking; none of the characters are securely drawn and the play does not proceed from cause to effect; metaphysically and psychologically it is without motivation. In the second

version the four characters personify *injustice.* The crucible is womanhood or womankind. It is sufficient for present purposes to indicate that in both versions of "Maternity" the last act is devoted to a trial of an abortionist. This abortionist is, as a matter of fact, in neither version the basic character. If either version of "Maternity" had been scientifically written in respect to organic structure, the last act would have been the trial of Lucie Brignac. In the first version Lucie Brignac has three children. There is no intimation that these children are diseased. In the second version Lucie Brignac has two children; they are diseased, as a result of their father's alcoholism, and the third child, upon whom an abortion was committed, was doomed or condemned by the doctor in advance of its birth, as a result of which the mother resorted to the abortionist. Mr. Brieux must have realized, in writing the second version, that his first version of "Maternity" was a tract pure and simple. The second version lacks organic structure for the reasons stated.

In "The Three Daughters of Monsieur Dupont" Mr. Brieux again fails to write a play with a basic character. The three daughters, Caroline, Julie and Angele, personify the basic emotion *longing.* The crucible of this play is *marriage.* Of the three plays "The Three Daughters of Monsieur Dupont" is the strongest.

"Damaged Goods" would have been a much stronger play dramatically if the third act had presented pro-

gressive action between the doctor, the father, George and Henrietta.

The great difficulty with Mr. Brieux as a playwright is his seeming inability to write a play with a single action or unity of expression. Let us examine and analyze his play "The Red Robe." The theme of this play is *torture,* personified in the examining magistrate, Mouzon. The crucible of the play is *the law.* Even here Mr. Brieux misses unity, for the crucible of the law is mixed up with the crucible of politics, something which should not happen in scientific playwriting. This play "The Red Robe" has three distinct and definite actions which may be segregated, each one of which constitutes a distinct and separate play. The main action of the play that Mr. Brieux intended to write is the action involving Mouzon (personifying the theme of torture) in emotional conflict and pitted emotionally against Etchepare, whose emotion is *innocence.* The second action is a distinct action between Mouzon, personifying torture, and Yanetta, whose basic emotion is *revenge.* The third action is between Mouzon, personifying *torture,* and Vagrant, whose basic emotion is *integrity.* In addition to having three distinct actions in this play, there is much irrelevant dialogue. Furthermore, the play is weakened by reason of the fact that Mr. Brieux intended to write a play the essence of which was an attack on the criminal law from a sociological and psychological standpoint, and the play becomes an attenuated mixture of the administration of

the law, rather than the law itself. To demonstrate that Mr. Brieux has an irrelevant action in this play between Mouzon and Yanetta, let us take the episode of Yanetta (personifying revenge) killing Mouzon (personifying torture)—not because of anything that Mouzon (torture) did to Etchepare (the primary action), but because of what Mouzon did to Yanetta, the victim in the secondary action.

It may be safely asserted that there are few dramatists who truly understand their own plays. A striking illustration of a playwright misconceiving the organic structure of his own play is that of Maxim Gorky in "The Judge." This play "The Judge," recently translated by Marie Zakrevsky and Barrett H. Clark, published by Robert M. McBride & Company, New York, 1924, contains a preface by Mr. Gorky. Mr. Gorky says: "In 'The Judge' for example, I have tried to show how repulsive a man may be who becomes infatuated with his own suffering, who has come to believe that he enjoys the right to torment others for what he has suffered. When such a man has convinced himself that such is his right, that he is for that reason a chosen instrument of vengeance, he forfeits all claims to human respect."

It is evident from the foregoing preface, and from the title of the play "The Judge," that Gorky considers the old man, personifying revenge or vengeance, as the basic character in the play. The fact is that the basic character in the play is Ivan Vassilievich Mastakoff.

The *theme* of this play is fear, personified in the character Mastakoff. The crucible is sin. The orientation is "Our sins will find us out." One has but to read and analyze this play to realize that Mastakoff, by reason of his earlier sin, has lived in fear—fear dominates him every step of the way. The dialogue discloses this to be a fact. In the play he has reached a state of prosperity and has become enamoured of Sofia Markovana. The old man becomes a nemesis. Ivan suicides through fear. His sin has found him out. This play "The Judge" discloses a progressive action through compartmented situations—all directly or indirectly motivating through fear. Ivan Mastakoff, personifying fear, has escaped from the penitentiary. He is penitent. He prospers. He builds. He succeeds. He is kind. He loves. He is pursued. He becomes a victim. The entire play is Ivan's play. It is not the old man's play.

The reader may, in this connection, with interest examine the recent play of Eugene O'Neill entitled "All God's Chillun Got Wings." Mr. Stark Young, dramatic critic for the New York *Times*, in the edition of August 24, 1924, writing of Mr. O'Neill's play, says that the theme of "All God's Chillun Got Wings" is *love* and not primarily a race problem. He says as entertainment it was not very much alive. Mr. Young says that Mary Blair, playing Ella Downey, gave indication of knowing what her part was about and what the struggle and surge of the play might mean. Mr. Young further says: "The essential theme of this

drama aims at the profundity of the great myth, dark with a mystery almost biological, beautiful with passionate desire for range and scope. The use of the Congo mask as symbolizing for the woman the negro race, the horror, the hate, is fine theatrical imagination. . . . These are tremendous spiritual and dramatic motivations, greatly imagined, moving and powerful with life."

We submit that if the text and directions of "All God's Chillun Got Wings" be examined, it will appear that the basic emotion or theme of the play is not love but *hatred,* and that this emotion of hatred is personified by the basic character, Ella Downey. Jim Harris, the negro man, whose basic emotion is *ambition,* is not the subject of Ella's love. Harris loved Ella and sought to protect her, but she hated the negro and her hatred is evidenced in practically every line of the manuscript. She did not marry Jim Harris because she loved him. If we examine this play for its metaphysical and psychological basis, we find but one possible motive—Ella Downey had been mistreated by Mickey, a white bum. She went to Jim Harris, the negro, as a retreat. One may search this manuscript in vain to find in Ella Downey one redeeming trait. She was a low, common white woman; her basic emotion was hate of the negro and everything that pertained to the negro. Jim Harris was kind to her; he was ambitious; he wanted to become a lawyer; he wanted to make something of himself. Ella's hatred of the

negro was so great that the mere thought of Jim Harris' successful outcome of his basic emotion *ambition* drove Ella mad, for it is apparent that she believed if Jim Harris became a lawyer his contempt for her as a character would grow and she would lose her sanctuary or retreat. She wanted Jim to be her uncle—she a little girl. At the end of Scene 2 of Act II the manuscript reads:

> ELLA. [*Stands looking at him, fighting with herself. A startling transformation comes over her face. It grows mean, vicious, full of jealous hatred. She cannot contain herself, but breaks out harshly with a cruel, venomous grin.*] You dirty nigger!

How can anyone read these lines without being persuaded that the metaphysical and psychological basis of Ella Downey's character was *hatred* for the negro.

It is through the Algebraic Formula that one secures the metaphysical and psychological analysis of a character in a play.

CHAPTER VII

EMOTION AS PRIMAL CAUSE

As in life, so in the science of playwriting, emotion is the primal cause. Mr. Price says ("The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," page 8): "Man was created a little lower than the angels and, we may surmise, in all modesty, is not altogether a worm; but his powers are relative. He has no instincts that are not shared by every human being in a greater or less degree. You may believe that you have the qualities of a dramatist. That is an altogether different matter. But what qualities? The drama or its material embraces every emotion felt by any human being."

Schiller is quoted by Barrett H. Clark (European Theories of the Drama, page 321) as saying:. " 'But tragedy has a poetic end, that is to say, it represents an action to move us, and to charm our souls by the medium of this emotion.' "

Again, at page 321: " 'But as it cannot attain its end, which is emotion, except on the condition of a perfect conformity with the laws of nature, tragedy is, notwithstanding its freedom in regard to history,

strictly subject to the laws of natural truth, which, in opposition to the truth of history, takes the name of poetic truth!"

Coleridge is quoted in Mr. Clarke's "European Theories of the Drama" as follows, page 432: " 'In this mode, the unity resulting from succession is destroyed, but is supplied by a unity of a higher order, which connects the events by reference to the workers, gives a reason for them in the motives, and presents men in their causative character.' "

Barrett H. Clark, in "A Study of the Modern Drama," page 181, says: "There is no doubt that the true tragedy is based upon something inevitable in the character of the protagonist, something that comes up against another character, or fate, or facts, that are too much for him. Accident, naturally, enters into the artist's scheme of things, but accident that is *not* accidental. There is the accidental accidental (in the instance I have just suggested) and there is the inevitable accidental, as in the last act of 'Hamlet.' "

The thing that Mr. Clark is discussing here is *causative character.*

In "The Judge" Ivan Mastakoff is the *causative character.* It is the theme of fear, growing out of a metaphysical antecedent, which creates the play.

In "The Changing Drama," by Archibald Henderson, at page 277 it is stated: "The interpreter of contemporary life has discovered that an emotion is as thrilling a dramatic theme as an action; and that pas-

sion is as deep and vital in its repression as its exhibition."

At page 72 Mr. Henderson says: "At the same time, there is involved in the examination an exhaustive knowledge of all antecedent factors in the evolutionary chain of causation."

At page 96 he says: "By illuminating the interiors of their very souls, showing them in crucial situations, depicting soul-struggles transpiring within them, the great dramatist of the contemporary school convicts and confounds his audience with a consciousness of the reality, the sternness, the infinite possibilities of human life. To awaken thought through emotion—such has often been narrowly defined to be the true and inalienable function of the drama."

At page 39 Mr. Henderson says: "'Art,' says Alfred Stevens, 'is nature seen through the prism of an emotion'; and a true work of art, the vitality moving vision of nature, is dateless and eternal."

Freytag says, in his "Technique of the Drama," at page 49: ". . . the essential parts, bound together and unified by some causative connection. . . ."

Again, at page 97 he says: "With peculiar emphasis, it must again be asserted that the tragic force must be understood in its rational causative connection with the fundamental conditions of the action."

At page 210 he says: "For, like the links of a chain, the nearly related images and ideas interlock

themselves during the poet's labor, one evoking another with logical coercion."

Again, at page 287: "Even in the case of events which seem very clear and are received by us in a dazzling light, we perceive a lack in our comprehension, not only because we know too little of that time, but also because we do not always understand what has come down to us, as the dramatic poet must understand it, in its causative connections and in its origin in the germ of a human life."

At page 313 he says: "And with a purpose, it may be emphatically repeated, that every drama must be a firmly connected structure in which the connection between cause and effect form the iron clasps, and that what is irrational can, as such, have no important place at all in the modern drama."

Let us illustrate what is meant by presenting men in their causative character: Assume that the playwright intends the construction of a play orientated from some concept of war. It need not be that "War is terrible," for there have been times in the history of the world when peace was more terrible than war. Be that as it may, the scientific playwright, having a more or less philosophical understanding of life, is likely to choose a basic emotion as his causative theme which will denote or connote the theory of war, or some concept of war which the dramatist intends to present. A playwright may select *ambition* as the causative theme.

This is a primal emotion. The craftsman may select *irony* as the causative theme, as did the authors of "What Price Glory"; he might select *patriotism*, as did Capt. Bruce Bainsfather in "The Better Ole." Whatever may be selected as the basic emotion, where the crucible is *war* the theme *is not war*. The theme is the basic emotion personified in the basic character, articulated throughout the play in which the crucible, pot, or container is war.

In fashioning a play wherein the crucible is war, if, for example, the play be motivated from the basic emotion *ambition*, the orientation may be in respect to a nation in the aggregate, or of its ruling classes, or some distinct or concrete class. Nations, like individuals, spurred on by ambition, undertake to dominate and control. Wars are fought for economic reasons, religious and racial reasons. Many are the causes of war. There is no cause, however, more pregnant than *ambition*. Ambition being a basic emotion, it is a constituent element of life itself; it is a part of the human spirit; it is the psychic echo of one of the greatest number of projective ideas (external or internal) in human consciousness. Ambition is indestructible and as long as men live and pulsate it will be a part of their being. This is irrefutable. It is true that emotions may be partially suppressed or controlled by other emotions; there is, however, no basic or fundamental emotion that may be destroyed or eradicated, except by death. Therefore, war will always exist; it will never

end, because its principal inciting cause (ambition) cannot be eliminated from the human spirit. If emotion may not be destroyed, if it exists in life and constitutes the main well-springs of life, it is a verity, a primal cause of life itself; it is a causative force.

Orientating a play upon the subject of war from the basic emotion of ambition, or any other suitable basic emotion, one may invent a thousand derivative compartmented situations. We therefore maintain that a basic emotion constituting the primal cause must be the fundamental and organic dramaturgical initiative. Whatever vision the imaginative horoscope may present to the playwright, the play must have its genesis in a basic emotion, and this must follow to a logical conclusion. This is what makes the play vibrant, virile and pulsate. In the dramaturgy of a play the basic emotion must permeate and impregnate the fibre and structure of the play so faithfully and definitively that the average mind will grasp and understand the thing which the playwright is undertaking to have represented. This is unity. This point has nowhere been more clearly stated than by Mr. Dryden, cited at page 184 of Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," as follows: " 'The unity of action in all plays is yet more conspicuous; for they do not burden them with under-plots, as the English do: which is the reason why many scenes of our tragi-comedians carry on a design that is nothing of kin to the main plot; and that we see two distinct webs in a play, like those in ill-

wrought stuffs; and two actions, that is two plays, carried on together, to the confounding of the audience; who, before they are warm in their concernments for one part, are diverted to another; and by that means espouse the interests of neither."

One of the best illustrations of the law of emotion as primary cause in a play and illustratively what a play should not be, may be found in "The Madras House," by Granville Barker. In this play the basic emotion or theme is morality, personified in Philip Madras. The crucible of this play is women or womankind. In the travel of this play Philip Madras, the basic character, personifying morality, as a normal man is put to it in solving the conflicts of the play, none of which as a matter of fact involve him, save in a minor degree.

Any craftsman, by using the Algebraic Formula, may readily indicate the vital defects in "The Madras House" as a play. In the first act the play deals with Harry Huxtable, Mrs. Katherine Huxtable, his wife, and their six daughters. The first act, in so far as these six girls are concerned, is wholly unrelated to the theme of the play, in so far as the basic character is concerned, and these girls do not appear in the play at any time after the first act. Difficulties of this family life are clearly not difficulties involving the theme of the play—morality—and Philip Madras.

The second act deals entirely with the Madras house and the store; it involves Miss Yates, Miss Chancellor and the Brigstocks; it is wholly unrelated to the theme

of the play (morality), in so far as morality directly involves the life of Philip Madras. The complication that existed between Mrs. Brigstock and Miss Yates was a complication that involved an entirely different action from the basic action of morality, personified in Philip Madras.

In the third act State, an American, buys the Madras house. The entire action and dialogue is wholly unrelated to the theme of the play—morality—as personified in Philip Madras.

The fourth act involves Major Thomas Constantine Madras; Mrs. Madras, his wife; Philip Madras and Jessica Madras, his wife.

In sum, this play, through four acts, by independent and unrelated episodes, grinds through the crucible of women or womankind without continuity and entirely in disregard of the law of cause and effect. As a result of the play's lack of consecutiveness and logical development from and through a causative character, the play lacks unity and in truth is not a play at all.

The derivative dramaturgical situations, as contradistinguished from the basic dramaturgical situations, will be discussed under the fifth element of the organic structure of the Algebraic Formula, that is "E." It is sufficient for present purposes to emphasize that the basic dramaturgical theme selected by the dramatist, that is, the primary emotion, whether it be a basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, must function through, co-ordinate with, and be re-

cognized in each succeeding element of the play.

Much has been written in respect to clearness in the writing of a play. If the basic theme is presented or represented with such definitive exposition as will enable the audience to recognize the theme practically at the outset of the play, clearness is established. There are many types of plays, including mystery plays, where, through individual technique, the basic theme is blinded until practically the close of the play. In this character of play, however, the physical action must be so entertaining, consistent and continuous as to hold the attention of the audience until the development of the theme is indicated.

The craftsman should bear in mind that any and every emotion is susceptible of intensive and varied classification. Emotions resolve themselves into elements and there are off-shoots. As has been stated by Prof. James in his treatise on psychology, these emotions often blend. It is important, therefore, that the craftsman recognize the distinct phase of the emotion which it is desired be made the dominant vibrant element in the basic character, and this must be adhered to in the development of the play.

Accurate and critical shading is often the test of artistic playwriting. With a view of illustrating our theory, it is thought appropriate to examine and analyze a few plays constantly referred to in text books and criticisms, having in mind the Algebraic Formula in respect to primal cause:

In the play "The Servant in the House" the basic theme is hypocrisy. Certain lines of characteristic dialogue may be serviceable. Manson, the servant, referring to clothes (page 19) says:

> They are the only things the people of this world see.

Again Manson says, page 22:

> . . . My religion is very simple. I love God and all my brothers.

The Vicar says, page 22:

> God and your brothers . . .

Manson says, page 22:

> Yes, sir: *all* of them.

The Vicar says:

> That is not always so easy, Manson; but it is my creed, too.

Vicar [*addressing his wife*]:

> . . . Do you know what your husband is in the sight of God? He is a liar.

Auntie says:

> William!

Vicar:

> A liar! I heard it in my ears as I stood up before Christ's altar in the church this morning, reciting my miserable creed! I heard it in my prayers! . . .

Vicar:

I am in the darkness. I don't know what to do. God has left me stranded.

Manson [*trying out the Bishop on his hypocrisy*]:

God's not watching: let's give as little, and grab as much as we can!

Bishop:

Do you mean to tell me that I've been sitting down to breakfast with a common working man?

Again the Bishop says:

Now, you said, Let's give as little and grab as much as we can. Of course, that is a playful way of putting it; but between ourselves, it expresses my sentiments exactly.

At another point the Vicar says, addressing his wife:

Do you think any blessing is going to fall upon a church whose every stone is reeking with the bloody sweat and anguish of the human creatures whom the wealth of men like that has driven to despair? Shall we base God's altar in the bones of harlots, plaster it up with the slime of sweating-dens and slums, give it over for a gaming-table to the dice of gamblers and of thieves?

Again Vicar says to his wife:

What else but idolatry is this precious husband-worship you have set up in your heart—you and all the

> women of your kind? You barter away your own souls in the service of it: you build up your idols in the fashion of your own respectable desires: you struggle silently amongst yourselves, one against another, to push your own god foremost in the miserable little pantheon of prigs and hypocrites you have created!

As will be seen, the primal cause of this play is *hypocrisy*. This play will be referred to again. The point we particularly wish to emphasize at this time is the theme of *hypocrisy*.

In Clyde Fitch's play "The Truth" the primal cause of the play is the basic emotion *lying*, personified in the causative character Becky Warder. This play is a perfect example of a causative character from primal cause moving from cause to effect.

In "The Scarecrow," by Percy MacKaye, the primal cause is the basic emotion *illusion*, personified in the causative character Lord Ravensbane. This primal cause functions from cause to effect all through the play.

In "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," by Pinero, the primal cause is *jealousy* of the causative character, Paula. In this play, however, there is a serious hiatus in the chain of cause and effect. Paula's jealousy of Ellean, whose basic emotion is purity, does not proximately cause Ellean to go to Paris. It is true that Ellean asks Paula (jealousy): "Well, what do you wish me to do—go away?" However, Ellean's going away was not brought about by Paula's jealousy; at

least the play does not psychologically motivate her going to Paris as a result of Paula's jealousy; it should have done so. In other words, the travel of the play from dramatic hole to dramatic hole is jealousy to Ellean, to Paris, to Capt. Ardale, to Aubrey, to Paula, to Paula's past.

Darwin's "Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals" lends to the consideration of emotion as primal cause. There is much in this work of Mr. Darwin that supports the postulate that all men of every race have identical physical expression of kindred emotions. The limitation of this volume precludes extensive quotation from Mr. Darwin's work, but the reader is encouraged to read Mr. Darwin's book. The general proposition is indicative. Mr. Darwin, at page 15, says: "Whenever the same movements of the features or body express the same emotions in several distinct races of man, we may infer with much probability, that such expressions are true ones,—that is, are innate or instinctive."

Investigation by Mr. Darwin, not always authoritative, but generally convincing, led him to make the following statement, page 17: "It follows from the information thus acquired, that the same state of mind is expressed throughout the world with remarkable uniformity; and this fact is in itself interesting as evidence of the close similarity in bodily structure and mental disposition of all the races of mankind." Mr. Darwin undertakes to describe, in a measure, the expres-

sive movements, under the different states of the mind, of some few well known animals.

If it be established that the same state of mind is expressed by different races of mankind with uniformity, it follows that the essence of playwriting is the physical or articulate expression of emotion as the causative force in the play which secures from a composite audience an emotional reaction that is true; that is, innate or instinctive. If the playwright in constructing his play ignores this truth, the play cannot be successful as a play. It will naturally cause confusion in the mind of the audience.

A remarkable example of playwriting where this principle was subconsciously adhered to by the author, Mr. George M. Cohan, is reflected in the successful play "Seven Keys to Baldpate." The basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, in this play is *adventure;* it is the theme of the play, personified in the character of Magee, the novelist. This play has complete unity and harmony in respect to the basic emotion constituting the theme of the play and is splendidly drawn toward the end of the play, when the supposed characters disclose that they are not real and at the very end Magee discloses the manuscript of the story "Seven Keys to Baldpate," which he had completed as an adventure. Stated in another way:—"Seven Keys to Baldpate," as a play, perfectly emotionalized, through personification of character, the common reaction of mankind to the basic emotion sought to be expressed,

and an average audience enjoyed the dramatic twist which enabled the author to play with his theme.

In "Abie's Irish Rose" (which has been much criticized) there is remarkable unity of thought and expression, which has found an emotional reaction in probably the greatest theatrical audience that has been accorded to dramatic effort. In the play "Abie's Irish Rose," the basic emotion or theme of which is *love*, there is compassed in the author's vision the following elements of love:

1. Solomon's love for his child;
2. Solomon's love for his race;
3. Solomon's love for his religion;
4. Solomon's love for the memory of his deceased wife, whose life was destroyed in the travail of childbirth;
5. Solomon's love for progeny;

Directly correlated, either by way of conflict or as a foil, there is—

6. The love between the boy and the girl;
7. The love of the boy and the girl for their respective fathers;
8. The love of the Priest and Rabbi for humanity;
9. The love of friends.

We have here nine forms of love, the greatest elemental emotion of mankind. No wonder that audiences re-act to this play! Its metaphysical and psychological aspects are all-encompassing. When weighed and considered through the analysis of the

Algebraic Formula its success may be readily understood. The science and artistry of this play, even though written subconsciously or instinctively by the author, will be adverted to under a succeeding chapter.

One of the most dramatic and greatest of plays, "A Doll's House," is perfectly constructed and its metaphysical and psychological aspects readily understood when *imprudence* is considered and understood as the basic emotion constituting the primal cause of the play. It is interesting to read Mr. William Archer's introduction to "A Doll's House" and "Ghosts" (Charles Scribner's edition—1923), for he, as do so many admirers of Ibsen, assumes that "A Doll's House" is a direct assault on marriage, from the standpoint of feminine individualism. If one considers the metaphysical and psychological aspect of Nora as a human being, incidentally bound in marriage according to the conventions of men, but not primarily as a wife, one will secure a more intelligent and comprehensive grasp of the power of this play. It is not as a wife that Nora must be viewed (although the crucible of the play is marriage); it is as a human being. Unfortunately, in the case (married and the mother of three children) her basic emotion (imprudence) led her to do a thing violative of the laws of man, to wit, forge her father's name to a note. This, however, was not done by Nora with a full knowledge of all that the act imported. She loved her husband; in her eyes he was a god; he was ill; she wanted to save his life; there was only one

course to pursue which seemed available to her; it was an imprudent course; however, it accomplished its result and it made her more or less proud of the accomplishment. Nora, being a woman with little knowledge of the world, and not being able to understand either the law or the ethics of the transaction, the chances of fate or luck placed her in a position where she became ground between the upper and nether millstone—ground between her husband's *integrity* and Krogstad's *despair*. In other words, Torvald's basic emotion (integrity) was in antagonism with Krogstad's basic emotion (despair), and in this complication Nora's imprudence was exposed. Nora's sublime and intense childish, though womanly, faith in her husband —her ideal—her god—was destroyed through his (Torvald's integrity—a narrow, exact and contracted integrity. Nora slammed the door, not because Ibsen was delivering an assault on marriage, but because, from a metaphysical and psychological standpoint, life for Nora with Torvald was an impossible thing. A woman whose emotional nature was as intense as that of Nora's would not live with a man of Torvald's emotional nature. There is no assault on marriage in "A Doll's House"; there is a wonderful dramatic presentation of a fundamentally impossible marriage.

When plays are either subconsciously, instinctively or scientifically constructed so that the motivation truthfully visualizes and personifies the elements of

conflict as that term will be discussed in its appropriate chapter, we secure physical expression and emotional re-action which is true and unified; or, as stated by Mr. Darwin, is innate or instinctive. Nora's slamming the door and leaving Torvald was not a diatribe or condemnation of marriage. Nora was instinct with emotion—her "doll's house"—her ideal—her miracle —her kingdom of heaven had been destroyed by an antagonistic basic emotion and life in this doll's house could never go on thereafter. For Nora to have done anything else than what she did do, her creator (Ibsen) would have been compelled to write a different play.

An analysis of the following plays will disclose the theme, that is, the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the primal cause of the play to be in

"A False Saint"	Penance
"Hindle Wakes"	Integrity
"Magda"	Tyranny
"Mrs. Dane's Defense"	Deception
"The Mollusc"	Tyranny
"All God's Chillun Got Wings"	Hatred
"The Nervous Wreck"	Hallucination
"Cobra"	Lust
"Expressing Willie"	Fear
"The Goose Hangs High"	Love
"White Cargo"	Despair
"The Bride"	Deception

"Cyrano de Bergerac"	Sacrifice
"As You Like It"	Disguise
"Hamlet"	Melancholy
"Macbeth"	Ambition
"Othello"	Jealousy
"Richelieu"	Ambition
"The Fool"	Sacrifice
"A New Way to Pay Old Debts"	Intrigue
"Polly Preferred"	Egotism
"The Outsider"	Egotism
"The Showoff"	Egotism
"Countess Julia"	Passion
"A Doll's House"	Imprudence
"Ghosts"	Dread
"The Master Builder"	Fear
"Pillars of Society	Deception
"Hedda Gabler"	Desperation
"The Wild Duck"	Innocence
"The League of Youth"	Egotism
"Rosmersholm"	Unscrupulousness
"The Fugitive"	Desperation
"Justice"	Madness
"The Mob"	Courage
"Lazybones"	Sacrifice
"Peter Pan"	Illusion
"Abie's Irish Rose"	Love
"Seven Keys to Baldpate"	Adventure
"The Farmer's Wife"	Desire
"Polly with a Past"	Desire

"Antigone" of Sophocles	Justice
"The Magistrate"	Deception
"Pygmalion"	Egotism
"The Clod"	Desperation
"Eugenically Speaking"	Daring
"Overtones"	Deceit
"Helena's Husband"	Vanity
"The Trimplet"	Love
"Nevertheless"	Integrity
"The Medicine Show"	Laziness
"Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil"	Obligation
"Spreading the News"	Pessimism
"Hyacinth Halvey"	Wickedness
"The Rising of the Moon"	Consideration
"The Jackdaw"	Advising
"The Workhouse Ward"	Quarrelling
"The Traveling Man"	Love
"The Gaol Gate"	Dread
"As a Man Thinks"	Forgiveness
"The Return of Peter Grimm"	Planning
"Romance"	Romance
"The Unchastened Woman"	Vanity
"The Lower Depths"	Satire
"Silence"	Sacrifice
"Old English"	Independence
"Desire Under the Elms"	Hardness
"Minick"	Meddling
"They Knew What They Wanted"	Deception

"What Price Glory"	Irony
"The Guardsman"	Acting
"The Firebrand"	Bragging
"Dancing Mothers"	Resentment
"The Best People"	Rebellion
"The Judge"	Fear
"In Old Kentucky"	Courage
"Lady Windemere's Fan"	Innocence
"The Second Mrs. Tanqueray"	Jealousy
"Michael and his Lost Angel"	Penance
"Strife"	Hardness
"The Weavers"	Hardness
"The Madras House"	Morality
"The Hour-Glass"	Desire
"The Truth"	Lying
"The Great Divide"	Hardness
"The Witching Hour"	Courage
"The Scarecrow"	Illusion
"The Vale of Content"	Longing
"The Red Robe"	Torture
"Know Thyself"	Duty
"Pelleas and Melisande"	Innocence
"Beyond Human Power"	Faith
"The Father"	Madness
"The Cherry Orchard"	Improvidence
"Widowers' Houses"	Hardness
"The Philanderer"	Philandering
"Mrs. Warren's Profession"	Morality
"Arms and the Man"	Adventure

CHAPTER VIII

THE LAW OF THE PLAY

MANY in authority assert that there is no law or rule of the drama; that *it is not a science;* that there are no permanent conventions. We have already undertaken to establish the contrary. It may not be amiss to cite additional authority.—Freytag (MacEwan edition) at page 2 says: "It may be considered certain that some of the fundamental laws of dramatic production will remain in force for all time; . . ."

At page 5 he says further: "Two thousand two hundred years have passed since Aristotle formulated a part of these laws for the Hellenes."

Archibald Henderson in "The Changing Drama" at page 310 says: "Unity of action, alone of the three unities, survives as an obligatory force; . . ."

We shall now endeavor to demonstrate that not only is emotion the primal cause, but, in order to create a play, a drama—not mere entertainment—we must, whatever type the play may be, have an organic structure in which emotion is pitted against emotion. This is another way of stating that a play is concentrated exposition of character in action, mental or physical, against seen and/or known and/or unseen and/or unknown forces.

There are many forms of entertainment which interest an audience. An entertainment may be barren of form and unemphatic in respect to emotion; nevertheless, if the playwright expects to rivet the attention of the auditor, it must be upon emotional and dramatic exposition, visualization and personification. People do not ordinarily go to a theater for either learning or the play of intellect. The theater is not the forum. Neither the essayist, the preacher, the doctrinaire, nor the propagandist leads or directs the theater. All classes of people are, at various times in their life, interested in the forms of entertainment thus presented, but not in the theater. When the masses go to the theater it is for diversion; they are interested in life, in action, concrete life. The masses enjoy the representation upon the stage of the character or characters in struggle, particularly when the struggle becomes sufficiently acute to cause the auditor to "pull" or "root" for the success or defeat of some one or more characters emphatically registered in the play.

The play is limited to approximately two hours of an evening's entertainment. Unless the auditor is permitted to grasp the thing in action or solution, to have his or her attention riveted, to understand and appreciate what the play is about, to obtain some metaphysical or psychological point of view, and to take part, as it were, in the travel of the performance and its solution within the period of time allotted, *there is no play*. Not every play need necessarily be well made

or closely knitted, but it must, by definite processes (attained either scientifically, subconsciously or instinctively) be presented in such form as the masses of the people may understand and grasp.

It may be asserted that the Algebraic Formula will not have value in playwriting; that it may have value in play dissection and litigation. Whether this Algebraic Formula becomes helpful to playwrights in playwriting construction is dependent, in our view, not upon its scientific certainty and accuracy, but upon the degree of receptivity and understanding of the playwright.

CHAPTER IX

PERSONIFIED BY CHARACTER

In logical sequence, the second element of the organic structure of a scientific or well-made play is that of the basic primary or central character.

The basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the theme selected by the playwright, must be personified in the basic, primary or central character or characters. It may be safely stated, as a general rule, that it is not good playwriting to have more than *one* basic, primary or central character, unless the characters personify the same emotion, inasmuch as two characters of the same magnitude, personifying separate and distinct emotions, will necessarily cause confusion in respect to the theme of the play. A lack of clearness is brought about through failure to recognize this rule. Mr. Dryden has stated this clearly (see Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama").

The science of clear craftsmanship is *one* theme, *one* central character, *one* plot. We have heretofore undertaken to show how a failure on the part of the craftsman to recognize this rule or law results in a hybrid play (see the "Madras House" and "The Red Robe").

A play functions through character. Many writers have considered that *theme* is character. This is true only in the sense that *the theme*, that is, the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, is personified in the basic character.

Many writers consider that *plot* is character. Plot is never character, for the dominant emotion which constitutes the theme, personified in the basic character, moves through the *plot* of the play and is motivated through crucible, conflict, complication and—or intrigue to ultimate crisis and climax.

How is an emotion personified? How is a character invented? What is the law, or art, of character invention?

Examination of the manuscript of plays, together with stage directions, disclose rare instances in which playwrights describe their characters. It means nothing in the creation or invention of a character to say that he or she is blonde or brunette, tall or short, fat or thin, hunchback or straight, blue- or cock-eyed. All of this has nothing whatsoever to do with the *invention* of character; it may have considerable influence with the casting director. Judgment in respect to casting, however, may well be left to the casting director as he naturally will not select similar types. Casting is a separate and distinct art and has little or nothing to do with the organic structure of the play. The cast of a play should, as a rule, be selected with the single thought as to their capacity for interpreting the play,

presenting it in an acceptable manner, and with general regard to the *tout ensemble.*

The invention of character, or the personification of an emotion in the characters in the play, is of vital importance. For a playwright to set out in his directions, or upon the entrance of a character, that he is a lawyer, a doctor, or a merchant, does not indicate character. There are hundreds of different characters, all of whom may very well be lawyers. Mr. Shaw, in "Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant," Vol. I., Preface, page xxiii, says: "It is astonishing to me that Ibsen, who devotes two years to the production of a three-act play, the extraordinary quality of which depends on a mastery of character and situation which can only be achieved by working out a good deal of the family and personal history of the individuals represented, should nevertheless give the reading public very little more than the technical memorandum required by the carpenter, the gasman, and the prompter. Who will deny that the result is a needless obscurity as to points which are easily explicable? Ibsen, interrogated as to his meaning, replies, 'What I have said, I have said.' Precisely; but the point is that what he hasn't said, he hasn't said. There are perhaps people (though I doubt it, not being one of them myself) to whom Ibsen's plays, as they stand, speak sufficiently for themselves. There are certainly others who could not understand them at any terms."

When we examine Mr. Shaw's plays and his direc-

tions and exposition of character, outside of dialogue, one may observe many ridiculous statements; for example, in "The Philanderer," page 94, the direction reads:

> The two men differ greatly in expression. The Colonel's face is lined with weather, with age, with eating and drinking, and with the cumulative effects of many petty vexations, but not with thought: . . .

How is any actor to indicate to an audience, either in make-up or expression, that his face is lined with the cumulative effects of many petty vexations, but not with thought?

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession," when Praed appears Mr. Shaw describes him as "carefully dressed, and clean-shaven except for a moustache, with an eager, susceptible face. . . ." Is it an unreasonable inquiry as to what Mr. Shaw means by "an eager, susceptible face?" What is "an eager, susceptible face?"

As a typical illustration of Mr. Shaw's directions, he has Praed say:

> Very kind of you indeed, Miss Warren. [*She shuts the gate with a vigorous slam: he passes in to the middle of the garden, exercising his fingers, which are slightly numbed by her greeting.*] . . .

There is no line of dialogue that indicates to the audience that Praed's fingers are numbed by her (Vivie) greeting. Without a line of dialogue, how could an actor, playing the part of Praed, convey to an

audience that he exercised his fingers because they were numbed by Vivie's greeting?

At page 167 Vivie says:

> So do I. [*She sits down.*] Sit down, Mr. Praed. [*This invitation is given with genial peremptoriness, his anxiety to please her clearly striking her as a sign of weakness of character on his part.*]

We propound the query—How could an actress playing the part of Vivie convey, without dialogue, to an audience the thought in her mind of weakness of character on Praed's part by his anxiety to please her? We submit that it would take some unusual form of radio or telepathic current from the actress to the audience to enable them to determine this point of direction contained in Mr. Shaw's play.

A book might be compiled containing nothing but continuous illustrations of this same form of foolishness on the part of Mr. Bernard Shaw. His plays abound in this drivel. This is not playwriting. It is a species of novel writing.

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession," at page 168, Vivie says:

> [*dubiously*] Eh? [*watching him with dawning disappointment as to the quality of his brains and character.*]

If there is any actress alive who could take the part of Vivie and convey to an audience her disappointment

as to the quality of Praed's brains and character, she would possess the quality of the Infinite. There is no line of dialogue showing that Vivie was disappointed as to the quality of Praed's brains and character.

The sense of a play cannot be communicated to an audience by direction. It must be communicated by *dialogue*. Prof. B. Roland Lewis' splendid book entitled "The Technique of the One-Act Play," at page 207 states: "Because of the comparative brevity of a one-act play, a character therein must not be too complex in its personality. Usually but a single dominant trait is emphasized, such as vanity, egotism, devotion, fidelity, duplicity, generosity, shrewdness, sense of honor, material tendencies, or what not." The reader will perceive that in each one of these dominant traits Prof. Lewis indicates either a basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion.

Mr. Dryden says (Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 198): " 'Under this general head of manners the passions are naturally included as belonging to the characters. I speak not of pity and of terror, which are to be moved in the audience by the plot; but of anger, hatred, love, ambition, jealousy, revenge, etc., as they are shown in this or that person of the play. To describe these naturally, and to move them artfully, is one of the greatest commendations which can be given to a poet: . . .' "

Choosing at random from the approximately six hundred themes tabulated in Chapter V. we select *sumptu-*

ousness as a possible theme or subject of a play. Let us disregard for the moment the point of orientation. We are to decide whether the basic character will be a man or a woman. If the basic or central character personifying the theme of *sumptuousness* be a man, the play will, in the very nature of things, be a very different play from what it would be if the basic character were a woman. Let us select as the crucible of the play *marriage*, the basic character a woman. We analyze, psychoanalyze, consider the metaphysical and psychological. If this woman is strongly characterized or personified, in the very nature of things, she becomes a difficult wife to any but a very rich man. Therefore, in order to create dramatic conflict, we elect to make the husband a poor man; we give him a basic emotion of *integrity*. Immediately we sense a battle-royal between a poor husband whose basic emotion is integrity, and a wife whose basic emotion is *sumptuousness*. Let us draw upon our imagination one point further—The sumptuous wife has a friend—a woman who is poor, but a schemer. This scheming friend has a male friend, rich, generous and daring; he gives diamonds, furs, tapestries. How easily follows the complication! —An afternoon tango dance, visiting a road-house, a late return, an automobile dashing across a railroad track, a wreck, a hospital, the police. A poor husband of integrity discovers the plight of a sumptuous wife.

Presenting "men in their causative character" (see Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page

432) is the essence of character invention. The causative character of sumptuousness in a woman married to a poor man of integrity will inevitably bring about derivative situations or episodes, incidents or accidents, as variously characterized, the proximate result of her sumptuousness. In inventing or creating this character the craftsman will search the soul of this woman and her character will, in a large measure, be drawn to plumb the personal contacts or understanding of the craftsman who is creating his child of phantasy. Dependent upon the craftsman's personal experiences, or his imagination or gift of construction, the sumptuous woman will have, as secondary or subsidiary emotions, such characteristics, traits or manners as will consistently and consecutively dramaturgically present the theme of the play. A sumptuous woman is calculated to have little self-control; if she is married to a poor man of narrow integrity, the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, which dominates her character would very likely cause her to do many things which she would not otherwise do. This is truly the science of character invention. One can readily vision an inexhaustible number of derivative situations—the direct and proximate effect of a causative character of sumptuousness in a woman.

The reader is invited to select one of the basic emotions set forth in Chapter V. and enjoy the fascination of building or inventing a character personifying one of these emotions. In order to have a causative character,

the basic character must personify the basic emotion which constitutes the selected theme of the craftsman and upon which he pivots his play. In every well-made or well-constructed play written in ancient mediæval or modern times, the playwright has followed his task either subconsciously, intuitively or instinctively. It may be done, and should be done, *scientifically*.

The basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the theme of the play, is often visualized, personified and emphasized not only through the basic character, but also through secondary or subsidiary characters, often by or through inanimate objects or elements, and may be done through symbolism. In every instance, however, there should be unity and harmony of characterization and expression, either in personality or symbolism, to avoid confusion.

What do we mean by a basic, primary or central character? We mean a character who dominates the play. The character who carries the principal rôle in the play, as a rule, the "star" of the play; the principal artist in the play; the one who definitely visualizes and personifies the basic emotion which is the theme of the play. It often happens that the showy or acting part is taken by a subsidiary or secondary character; for example see "Polly Preferred," "The Servant in the House." In the play "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the principal character, Sir Giles Overreach, personifying the basic emotion *intrigue*, dominates the entire structure of the play. Let us consider the play "A New

Way to Pay Old Debts" with the character of Sir Giles Overreach eliminated—there would be no play whatever. Every character in the play is subsidiary to the dominant and dominating intriguer.

In many artistic plays the major or dominant characterization is dual or complex; for example, in the play "Expressing Willie" the basic, primary or central character personifying the basic emotion *fear* is a complex of Willie Smith and Minnie Whitcomb. At times a dual personification is the ultimate of fine characterization; this may truly be said in the play "Expressing Willie." Nevertheless, unless the playwright be an artist in characterization, and unless he has a very definite understanding of the personification of a basic emotion, dual personification of the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the theme may become confusing.

In a recent play entitled "Cheaper to Marry," by a very successful playwright (a playwright indeed of considerable genius), there was much confusion of character. It is difficult to say who the author intended as the basic character in the play.

In the play "Cobra" the personification of the basic emotion is confusing. When the title of the play is considered, "Cobra" (doubtless intended to describe Elise Van Zile, the leading woman), the natural inference is that this character personifies the basic emotion or theme of the play—*lust.* As a matter of fact, the basic, primary or central character in the play "Cobra"

is not Elise Van Zile, but the man Jack Race. In the play "Cobra" we have dual and complex personification of the basic emotion *lust.* The author struggled to make Jack Race a respectable and responsible character. This he could not possibly do, for when Jack Race is analyzed metaphysically and psychologically (measured by every reasonable probability indicated in the play) he was a rotter who never could have become a gentleman and was wholly unworthy of Judith Drake. If Judith Drake had the sense of perception that the play undertook to give her, it is reasonably certain that she would never marry Jack Race; or, if it be a truism that a woman rarely knows how to select a husband, Judith Drake's marriage to Jack Race would exemplify the rule.

Without a dominating, determinative and definitive character personifying the basic emotion there must, of necessity, be confusion in the development of the play. The demonstration of this statement may easily be made:—Assume that the playwright has chosen as his basic emotion *love;* that he has elected to personify this basic emotion *love* in the basic character of a mother —Instantly there comes to the mind any number of conditions or situations in which the love of a mother plays a part; it may take many forms or fancies. It is essential that the playwright select or elect that phase of mother-love which exemplifies and personifies a normal condition of life, and one which is entirely in character with respect to that phase of mother-love which it is

proposed to personify, else the character will not run true to nature. One of the most fundamental instincts of motherhood revolves around the preservation of the mother's offspring. A natural corollary is that of *sacrifice*. If the play fails to arouse specifically and concretely the emotions following the primal normal attributes of motherhood, the play will, most likely, fail; or, in any circumstance, it will be repulsive, unless there be presented some extraordinary exception, and if so, there must be emphasized and registered a fundamental reason for the exception.

If the basic emotion personified by character runs contrary in the development of the play to the established and understood rule of nature, there must be developed metaphysically or psychologically a scientific or probable reason for the departure. Let us illustrate: If the playwright intends to write a play orientated from an idea where a mother is personified as the basic character, and the personification runs contrary to nature or normal laws in respect to her child or children (and these cases truly exist), the basic theme must be an emotion which is the causative force of such a result; for example: if the play be pivoted upon the basic emotion *hallucination*, it is readily conceivable that this emotion, personified by a mother, may result in abnormal conditions when we come to the motivation, the plot, or the compartmentation of the play. Mrs. Erlynne, in "Lady Windemere's Fan" is an illustration of an abnormal mother, Mrs. Erlynne personifying

blackmail, although Mrs. Erlynne is a notable example of blending emotions, for her secondary or subsidiary emotions show sacrifice and love.

As has already been indicated, when we speak of the primary or central character, it is not intended to foreclose or preclude the idea that one or more of the secondary characters coming under the organic structural elements of the play included in subdivision "F" (Incidental Detailed Construction) may not likewise personify the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion. Numerous plays may be cited wherein one or more of the secondary characters, incidental and subordinate in relation to the basic, primary or central character, personify the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion chosen as the theme of the play. In the play "The Outsider" the basic emotion is *egotism.* The basic character is the doctor who is denominated as "The Outsider," and whose basic emotion is egotism. A number of the secondary characters in the play ("insiders"—doctors) represent the licensed and organized medical profession. These characters are, in each instance, egotists, that is to say, each and every one of them personifies the same basic emotion as "The Outsider"; nevertheless, these secondary characters are soft-pedaled. "The Outsider" and the "insiders" struggle throughout the play—one class (the "insiders") on behalf of the accepted order, that is, those *who have,* as against the basic character in the play ("The Outsider"), who represents, for the purposes of

the play, those who *have not;* or, stated in another way, the struggle in the play is between those *in power* and those *out of power.*

In what way does the basic, primary or central character personify the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion? The answer is—either by what the character *is*, or by what he *says*, or by what he *does*, or by what other characters in the play *do* to the basic character, of by what other characters in the play *say* to the basic character, or by what other characters *say* the basic character *is*, or by what they *say about him.* Thus it may be seen that there are seven ways in which a character is personified. In any event, all of this must, directly or indirectly, delineate, describe, define or circumscribe a basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion. Dryden says (Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 196): " 'From the manners, the characters of persons are derived; for, indeed, the characters are no other than the inclinations as they appear in the several persons of the poem; a character being thus defined—that which distinguishes one man from another. Not to repeat the same things over again which have been said of the manners, I will only add what is necessary here. A character, or that which distinguishes one man from all others, cannot be supposed to consist of one particular virtue, or vice, or passion only; but 'tis a composition of qualities which are not contrary to one another in the same person; thus, the same man may be liberal

and valiant, but not liberal and covetous; so in a comical character, or humor (which is an inclination to this or that particular folly), Falstaff is a liar, and a coward, a glutton, and a buffoon, because all these qualities may agree in the same man; yet it is still to be observed that one virtue, vice, and passion ought to be shown in every man as predominant over all the rest; as covetousness in Crassus, love of his country in Brutus; and the same in characters which are feigned!"

" 'The chief character or hero in a tragedy, as I have already shown, ought in prudence to be such a man who has so much more of virtue in him than of vice, that he may be left amicable to the audience, which otherwise cannot have any concernment for his sufferings; and it is on this one character that the pity and terror must be principally, if not wholly, founded; a rule which is extremely necessary, and which none of the critics, that I know, have fully enough discovered to us. For terror and compassion work but weakly when they are divided into many persons.' "

The audience visualizes the character in that the character presents ocular demonstration of his emotional, physical and/or mental powers. The audience observes the character's physique, manner, personality and individuality. The character personifies the basic primary emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, by what he *is*, by what he *says*, and by what he *does*, or by what is *done to him*, or by what is *said to him*, or by what is *said about him*, or by what is *said*

that he is. It is in this manner that the character's metaphysical and psychological being is reflected. This enables the audience to interpret, through the character or characterization, the *theme.* It likewise presents and represents the antecedent—the chain of causation. It is in this way that a character is tagged or identified, and this rule holds good in respect to the secondary characters as well, whether these secondary characters are subsidiary to the basic or primary character, or whether they are given a place and being in the play for the purpose of developing some one of the other constituent elements in the play.

If the thing that the basic character *is,* if what he *says* or *does* in the play is consistent and consonant with, as well as responsive to the basic emotion, the character runs true to form; that is to say, the character is *in character.* On the other hand, the character is *out of character* if the thing that the character is, or says, or does is unresponsive, antagonistic to, or in contradiction of the particular basic emotion which the character personifies, in which latter situation the play will necessarily be confusing and abortive. This does not necessarily mean that a character's subsidiary or secondary emotions may not, in some measure, cross or conflict with the basic emotion, for a character's greatest conflict may be introspective, that is to say, the dramaturgy of a character may be the character's battle or struggle with himself, that is, his basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion.

A number of illustrative plays might be used to indicate a character *out* of character, or *in* and *out* of character. It is a very common failing of Mr. Bernard Shaw to have his characters *in* and *out* of character, or *in* and *out* of a basic emotion many times during the course or development of his plays.

What is the science of character invention? What are the classifications of character? A character is not created by any emotional description. A character is created solely and only by emotional evolution.

When is a character a *stock* character or an original character?

A *stock* character is one chosen from the theatrical shelf—from literature—a well recognized type—one who may be unmistakably identified—a character one meets on the streets—in society—in place or power. On the other hand, a character may be purely an invented character—a creature of the playwright's imagination—purely fictional in many or all respects; for example, the characters in "Chanticleer," "The Scarecrow," "Outward Bound." In any circumstance, the character must be consistent and entirely in character with the basic theme or emotion, or the basic emotion personified by a secondary character. Let us consider a play wherein the basic theme is *jealousy*, personified in the character of a man—the craftsman must not vacillate in his own conception or expression of the character in relation to the particular phase of jealousy which the character personifies, and this jealousy must

be motivated; there must be a metaphysical reason, or a psychological one, for the existence of the particular phase of jealousy which the character personifies. Jealousy has as many shades and as much coloring as the chameleon. There must not be confusion in the mind of the auditor as to the true shade which the craftsman intends to picture or paint. Many plays fail by reason of confusing personification of character. The spoken drama derives its greatest power and strength through the interest which it naturally arouses in an audience in *personality*. Practically all mankind are hero-worshippers. An audience is more interested in people—individual or aggregate—than in anything else connected with the play. Paula Tanqueray was a jealous woman. Othello was a jealous man. Paula Tanqueray's jealousy was directed against her step-daughter; Othello's jealousy against his wife.

The question of personification of character, as represented by secondary characters, will be discussed at greater length in the sixth element of the Algebraic Formula (F-subdivision 1.).

In many plays, and sometimes in more or less successful plays, there is considerable confusion in characterization—many times in respect to the primary character. This confusion should *never* exist and *cannot* exist in a scientific play. In "The Servant in the House" it is not Manson (the servant) who is the basic character; it is the Vicar. Many are led to believe that "the servant" in the house is the basic character. The

playwright may have intended Manson to be the basic character; it is the Vicar who personifies and dominates in respect to the basic theme—*hypocrisy*. The Bishop of Lancashire, a secondary character, personifies *hypocrisy*. Auntie, the Vicar's wife, personifies hypocrisy. The theme of hypocrisy is symbolized in the drain under the church, which is supposed to be the cause of the stink or smell and in connection with which Robert Smith, the drainman, is employed. Manson, the Bishop of Benares, is, in reality, the symbol of truth through which the hypocritical Vicar is brought back to God.

In "A False Saint" Julie is, as a matter of course, the basic character and easily identified.

In "Hindle Wakes" there is difficulty in identifying the theme in the basic character. An examination of Barrett H. Clark's "A Study of the Modern Drama," pages 303, 304 and 305, indicates that Mr. Clark is of the opinion that either Alan or Fanny constitutes the basic character. It is our opinion that the theme is integrity, and that the basic character is Nathaniel Jeffcote, the mill-owning father, who personifies *integrity*. It is Nathaniel Jeffcote who dominates the play, and it is his integrity that brings the play down to the point referred to by Mr. Clark in "A Study of the Modern Drama," pages 304–305. Fanny Hawthorn, Alan Jeffcote and Beatrice Farrar are secondary characters. This play will be discussed at length upon this point at a later period in this volume.

In "Magda" the basic character is somewhat confusing. From the title of the play one might be led to believe that Magda is the basic character, when in truth Schwartze is the basic character, who personifies the basic emotion *tyranny*. The play begins and ends with the father's tyranny. As a matter of fact, Magda, for what she is, good or bad, is the direct result or effect of Schwartze's tyranny. Schwartze's tyranny is the cause of Magda.

In "Mrs. Dane's Defence" Mrs. Dane is the basic character, personifying *deception*.

In "The Mollusc" Mrs. Baxter is the basic character, personifying *tyranny*.

In "The Magistrate" Agatha Posket is the basic character. The truth is Agatha Posket is the primary or proximate cause of all that happens in the play. Everything in the play is the result of Agatha Posket's *deception* in respect to her age and her son. This furnishes the travel of the play, the complication and the intrigue.

In "All God's Chillun Got Wings" Ella Downey is the basic character, personifying *hatred*.

In "The Nervous Wreck" Henry Williams is the basic character, personifying *hallucination*.

In "Cobra" Jack Race is the basic character, personifying *lust*.

In "Expressing Willie" Willie Smith and Minnie Whitcomb, dual and complex characters, personifying the basic emotion *fear*.

In "The Goose Hangs High" the basic character is Bernard Ingals, personifying *parental love.*

In "White Cargo" the basic character is Langford, personifying *despair.*

In "The Bride" the basic character is Marie Duquesne, personifying *deception.*

In "The Fool" the basic character is Daniel Gilchrist, personifying the basic emotion *sacrifice.*

In "Abie's Irish Rose" the basic character is Solomon Levy, personifying *love.*

In "Seven Keys to Baldpate" the basic character is Magee, personifying *adventure.*

In "As You Like It" the basic character is Rosalind, personifying *disguise.*

In "The Farmer's Wife" the basic character is Sweetland, personifying *desire.*

In "Peter Pan" the basic character is Peter Pan, personifying *illusion.*

In "Polly Preferred" the basic character is Bob Cooley, personifying *egotism.*

In "Silence" the basic character is Jim Warren, personifying *sacrifice.*

In "Old English" the basic character is Sylvanus Heythorp, personifying *independence.*

In "Minick" the basic character is Old Man Minick, personifying *meddling.*

In "Desire Under the Elms" the basic character is Ephraim Cabot, the father, who personifies *hardness.*

In "They Knew What They Wanted" the basic character is Tony, personifying *deception.*

In "What Price Glory" the basic character is Capt. Flagg, personifying *irony.*

In "The Guardsman" the basic character is the *actor,* personifying *acting.*

In "The Firebrand" the basic character is Cellini, personifying *bragging.*

In "Dancing Mothers" the basic character is Ethel Westcourt, personifying *resentment.*

In "The Best People" the basic characters are dual, to wit, Marion Lenox and Bertie Lenox, personifying *rebellion.*

In "Pygmalion" the basic character is Prof. Higgins, personifying *egotism.*

In "The Master Builder" the basic character is Solness, personifying *fear.*

In "Pillars of Society" the basic character is Bernick, personifying *deception.*

In "Hedda Gabler" the basic character is Hedda Gabler, personifying *desperation.*

In "The Wild Duck" the basic character is Hedvig, personifying *innocence.*

In "The League of Youth" the basic character is Stensgard, personifying *egotism.*

In "Rosmersholm" the basic character is Rebecca West, personifying *unscrupulousness.*

In "As a Man Thinks" the basic character is Dr. Selig, personifying *forgiveness.*

In "The Return of Peter Grimm" the basic character is Peter Grimm, personifying *planning*.

In "Romance" the basic character is Thomas Armstrong, the Bishop, personifying *romance*.

In "The Unchastened Woman" the basic character is Caroline Knollys, personifying *vanity*.

In "Polly With a Past" the basic character is Rex Van Zile, personifying *desire*.

In "Suppressed Desires" the basic character is Henrietta, personifying *delusion*.

In "Aria da Capo" the basic character is Pierrot, personifying *illusion*.

In "Cocaine" the basic character is Nora, personifying *love*.

In "Night" the basic character is the woman, personifying *rebellion*.

In "Enemies" the basic character is He, personifying *idealism*.

In "The Angel Intrudes" the basic character is Jimmy Pendleton, personifying *love*.

In "Bound East for Cardiff" the basic character is Yank, personifying *friendship*.

In "The Widow's Veil" the basic character is Katy MacManus, personifying *anticipation*.

In "The String of the Samisen" the basic character is Tamo, personifying *sacrifice*.

In "Not Smart" the basic character is Milo Tate, personifying *innocence*.

In the first version of "Maternity" the basic character

is Lucie Brignac, personifying *sacrifice.* In the second version of "Maternity" the basic characters are the four women, Lucie Brignac, Madeleine, Annette and Catherine, personifying *injustice.*

In "The Three Daughters of Monsieur DuPont" the basic characters are Caroline, Julie and Angele, the three daughters of Monsieur DuPont, personifying *longing.*

In "Damaged Goods" the basic character is George, personifying *selfishness.*

In "Justice" the basic character is Falder, personifying *madness.*

In "The Mob" the basic character is Stephen More, personifying *courage.*

In "The Pigeon" the basic character is Christopher Wellwyn; personifying *charity.*

In "The Fugitive" the basic character is Clare, personifying *desperation.*

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the basic character is Lady Windemere, personifying *innocence.* It is interesting to compare a play like "Lady Windemere's Fan," by Oscar Wilde, with "The Wild Duck," by Ibsen. In each of these plays the theme is innocence—in "Lady Windemere's Fan" an innocent wife (Lady Windemere); in "The Wild Duck" an innocent child (Hedvig). In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the crucible is *parentage;* in "The Wild Duck" the crucible is *marriage.* The orientation of "Lady Windemere's Fan" is —"A woman may not know her own mother."—In

"The Wild Duck" the orientation is—"It is a wise man who knows his own child." In "Lady Windemere's Fan" Lady Windemere was the victim of her mother's blackmailing. In "The Wild Duck" Hedvig is the victim of her mother's deception.

In "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" the basic character is Paula.

In "Michael and His Lost Angel" the basic character is the Rev. Michael Feversham.

In "Strife" the basic character is John Anthony, chairman of the Trenartha Tin Plate Works; he personifies *hardness.*

In "The Weavers" the basic character is Dreissiger, the fustian manufacturer, personifying *hardness.*

In each of the plays "Strife" and "The Weavers" the crucible is *capital and labor,* and in each of these plays the conflict is largely made up of *the mob.*

In "The Madras House" the basic character is Philip Madras; in "The Hour-Glass" the basic character is the wise man; in "The Truth" the basic character is Becky Warder; in "The Great Divide" the basic character is Stephen Ghent; in "The Witching Hour" the basic character is Jack Brookfield; in "The Scarecrow" the basic character is Lord Ravensbane; in "The Vale of Content" the basic character is Elizabeth, the second wife of Wiedemann; in "The Red Robe" the basic character is Mouzon; in "Know Thyself" the basic character is Clarisse de Siberan; in "Pelleas and Melisande" the basic character is Melisande (Here is an-

other play in which the theme is *innocence*); in "Beyond Human Power" the basic character is Pastor Sang; in "The Father" the basic character is the cavalry captain; in "The Cherry Orchard" the basic character is Madame Ranevsky; in "Widowers' Houses" the basic character is Sartorius; in "The Philanderer" the basic character is Leonard Charteris; in "Mrs. Warren's Profession" the basic character is Vivie, the daughter of Mrs. Warren; in "Arms and the Man" the basic character is Bluntschli.

In Freytag's "Technique of the Drama," at page 248, it is said: "Every one of us imputes to the dog and to the cat ideas and emotions which are familiar to us; and only because such a conception is everywhere a necessity and a pleasure, are animals so domesticated. This tendency to personify expresses itself incessantly: in intercourse with our fellow men, daily; at our first meeting with a stranger; from the few vital expressions which come to us from him; from single words, from the tone of his voice, from the expression of his countenance, we form the picture of his complete personality."

Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, in "The Foundations of a National Drama," at page 124 says: "In talk and manner all Shakespeare's characters are Elizabethan. Inwardly and spiritually the most of them do mainly belong to no country and no age, but only to Western humanity at large."

At page 152 he again says: "Every sentence the dramatist writes has to illustrate the character of the

speaker, and has also to carry on the story, not directly, but indirectly and by implication. How very unlike real life this is! When in real life do you hear people talking in such a way as to unfold the dearest secret of their hearts; betraying their thoughts and all the springs of their actions; and in the same sentence carrying on a definite, connected, involved, organic history?"

Again, at pages 186–187 he says: "We may say indeed 'inconsistency of character is what Nature mainly shows of human beings. Consistency of character is what is demanded of the dramatist when he tries to show them.' "

At page 194 he says: "The old dramatists used to label their characters by a single quality, or by their trade or profession. There is a great deal to be said for this way of naming characters in drama."

It may be noted here that characters are not invented by their trade or profession; they are invented by their *emotions.*

It may be well to observe at this time that there can be no right of pre-emption, nor may a pre-emptive right be secured, through copyright of a play, in a *stock character.* Pre-emption may be secured in a purely fictional or invented character. There is, however, in literature few instances of purely fictional or invented characters; for example: in "Countess Julia" the character of Julia, personifying *passion,* is purely a stock character. On the other hand, "Faust" may be said to be an *invented* character.

If two plays have the same basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, and one basic character is a man and one a woman, there cannot, in the very nature of things, be an infringement, for it is impossible to write a play, the theme of which is personified in a man, and have the same organic structure as the theme personified by a woman. The question of what constitutes infringement will be discussed in a succeeding chapter.

It may not be inappropriate at this time to indicate how the basic emotion, or the element in or of a basic emotion, is personified in the basic character. A typical play is "Hindle Wakes." In "Hindle Wakes" the basic character, Nathaniel Jeffcote, who personifies *integrity*, first appears in Scene 2, Act I. In the edition published by John L. Luce & Company, at page 36, when Jeffcote is told by Christopher, the father of Fanny, that Fanny has been wronged, Jeffcote's first speech is:

> Then by Gad! I'll have it out with him to-morrow. If he doesn't promise to wed thy Fanny I'll give him the sack!

Christopher then tells Jeffcote that it is his boy Alan who ruined Fanny. Jeffcote says:

> Say that again . . . My Lad.

Christopher then explains to Jeffcote the circumstances, proving that Alan Jeffcote was with Fanny.

In Act I. Scene 3, Jeffcote, in colloquy with his boy Alan says:

> I said I'd see him treated right.

Again, Jeffcote (dangerously) says to his boy Alan:

> I said I'd see them treated right. If thou expects I'm going to square it with a cheque, and that thou's going to slip away scot free, thou's sadly mistaken.

Alan says:

> What do you want me to do?

Jeffcote:

> I know what thou's going to do. Thou's going to wed the lass.

At page 52 Jeffcote says to his boy:

> There's only one lass thou can honestly wed now, and that's Fanny Hawthorn, and by God I'm going to see that thou does it!

At page 57 Jeffcote, [*speaking to his wife, says*]:

> Upon my soul, mother, I'd no idea thou were such an unscrupulous one before. Don't you want to do what's right?

At page 62 Jeffcote says:

> Very well. He's reckoned without his dad. If he's too much of a coward to face the music himself, I'll do it for him.

At page 67 Jeffcote tells Sir Timothy that Alan is going to wed Fanny. At page 75 Sir Timothy says to Jeffcote:

> . . . thank God I'm not like thee, Nat Jeffcote. I sometimes think thou's got a stone where thy heart should be by rights.

Jeffcote says:

> Happen, I've got a pair of scales.

At page 89 Jeffcote says:

> There'll be no wriggling out. Alan has got to pay what he owes, and I don't think there's any doubt what that is. . . .

At pages 91 and 92 Jeffcote says:

> . . . Before I knew who the chap was I said he should wed her, and I'm not going back on that now I find he's my own son. . . .

All of the foregoing lines indicate, construe and interpret Jeffcote's *integrity*.

In "The Fool," by Channing Pollock, Brentano's edition, at page 41 Goodkind first indicates that Daniel Gilchrist's character personifies *sacrifice*. Goodkind says:

> Yes. I could understand if he'd spent the money on himself, but he hasn't! He's given it away.

Daniel's first speech is, page 43:

A church that isn't big enough for two little men, Mr. Benfield, must be somewhat crowded for God!

Goodkind says:

Pneumonia weather, Daniel! Where's your overcoat?

Daniel says:

Outside.

At page 46 Daniel says:

That we were Christians, and every man our brother, and that we were sitting, over-dressed and over-fed, in a Christian Church, while our brother froze and starved—outside—in a Christian World!

Gilchrist was fired out of the Church because he would not give up his convictions; he sacrificed his position for his convictions. At page 86 Clare says:

Are you honestly happy?

Daniel says:

Honestly.

Clare:

In just helping others?

Daniel:

In just helping others.

Clare:

I don't understand that.

Daniel:

You will some day.

The entire play "The Fool" personifies *sacrifice* in Daniel Gilchrist.

CHAPTER X

SUBSIDIARY OR SECONDARY EMOTIONS OF A BASIC OR SECONDARY CHARACTER

THE necessity for a basic, primary or central character, or distinct or important secondary characters, to have a basic or dominant emotion, or element in or of a basic or dominant emotion, constituting the personification or characterization, does not preclude or inhibit the idea, desirability or necessity of the character (whether basic or secondary) having subsidiary or secondary emotions. The important point to be remembered in connection with this question of characterization is that the subsidiary or secondary emotion must not be contradictory of the basic or dominant emotion. The subsidiary or secondary emotions must not impinge upon, destroy or confuse, or be inconsistent with the dominant emotion. These subsidiary or secondary emotions should always be selected so that they will aid in the motivation of the play from the basic emotion, otherwise the character will lack unity and harmony and may result in secondary or tertiary actions, causing the play to disintegrate in one or more inharmonious and discordant directions.

It often happens that the subsidiary or secondary emotions of the basic character, or the variant emotions,

whether basic or secondary, of the secondary characters tend to aid the creation of the essential dramaturgy. In the American comedy "Pigs," by Anne Morrison and Patterson McNutt, there is a dual personification of the basic emotion constituting the theme, to wit, desire in the characters of Mildred Cushing and Thomas Atkins, Jr. Whilst the character of Thomas Atkins, Jr. (personifying desire to become a veterinary), is definitively written, dual characterization of Mildred Cushing (personifying desire) is not as definitively expressed. No one reading the play "Pigs," or witnessing its performance, could definitively determine the psychological or metaphysical character of Mildred Cushing; her blackmailing and snooping proclivities in particular are written and registered so emphatically that her basic emotion of desire to marry is over-shadowed and made confusing. "Pigs" violates in this respect the admonition of Mr. Dryden (see Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 196), in that the virtue of desire in Mildred is not written so predominantly as to make her character stand out. Dryden says ("European Theories of the Drama," page 196): " 'If the inclinations be obscure, it is a sign the poet is in the dark and knows not what manner of man he presents to you; and consequently you can have no idea, or very imperfect, of that man, nor can judge what resolutions he ought to take or what words or actions are proper for him.' "

The inclinations of Mildred Cushing in "Pigs" are so

obscure, in respect to blackmail, snoopishness, meddling, honesty, etc., that one cannot determine what manner of woman she is or was intended by the author to be. Furthermore, in the development of the character of Mildred Cushing there is, in the climax or dénouement, no conversion of character or change of will to make clear in the mind of the audience just what her soul or spirit is.

✓There should be clearness, lucidity and definitiveness in the registration of the basic emotion, or the element in or of the basic emotion constituting the theme. ✓ A recent play entitled "Cheaper to Marry," by an unusually successful playwright, failed to register the basic emotion. The play abounded with delightful epigrams and witty cynicisms; the characters in the play were interesting types; in the types presented there were seven basic emotions, as follows: love, selfishness, humiliation, friendship, sacrifice, self-respect, integrity. However, there was no time in the development of the action when one was able to say definitely which character or which basic emotion the author intended to make pre-eminent and dominate the play. The first character who appeared upon the stage was Florence Lowery, an interesting secondary character reflecting the author's "Broadway seasoning." Evelyn Gardner, the mistress of Jim Knight, might have been made the causative character in the play had she been selected as the personification of the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the

theme of the play. The author, not having really determined in his own mind where the play started from or where it was going to, permitted each character to run riot and cause confusion. Evelyn Gardner personified *humiliation*. If humiliation had been taken as the theme of the play, and she as the causative character, the story might have been developed successfully. Melville Masters, the musician, personifying self-respect, was one of the tightest drawn characters in the play, and the play might have been evolved or developed by the craftsman if he had used this character as the theme or causative force of his play. Jim Knight, personifying selfishness, might have been the causative character of a very strong play. This character was liberal in recklessly giving money to women who responded to his physical needs. A fine introspective play might be developed from this idea or point of orientation, that is, of a man who, as a causative character of selfishness, believed in his virtue and unselfishness because he was liberal to those who gave themselves to him generously. The psychological and metaphysical antecedent and reaction of a man of this type offers a fine field for dramatic and introspective playwriting. In the play as written the character Charles Tyler personified friendship. The character was poorly drawn, because there was no psychological or metaphysical basis for a friendship such as Tyler evidenced for Knight. Merely taking a man in partnership and working with him in business is not a suf-

ficient basis, either psychologically or metaphysically, for a man to allow his wife to associate with his partner's "kept woman"; nor is it justification for a man permitting his wife to be misled and deceived. If the kept woman shows a causative character justifying the friendship or companionship of the world at large, that is a different thing. If the character of Charles Tyler had been disclosed to be under some real obligation to Knight—for example—if Knight had saved Tyler's life, or the life of Tyler's mother, or had performed some transcendent service to Tyler which had put Tyler in a situation where he could not honorably sacrifice his friendship for Knight, there would have been the basis for a fine dramatic play. Beulah Parker, the wife of Tyler and personifying sacrifice, willing to give him whatever she had to save the firm from insolvency, might have been made a causative character in the play; as written, her character is poorly drawn, for it is inconceivable that she would have been misled by Evelyn Gardner, or what Evelyn Gardner represented. Beulah Parker, as characterized, was so asinine that she did not understand the difference between Jim Knight's baubles and toys and the fine manhood offered by her husband. He would have been happier without her. Everett Riddle, personifying integrity, is the most convincing character in the play. The play failed because it had no theme, in that the play wandered and digressed and lacked organic structure.

For a concrete illustration of subsidiary or secondary emotions, attention is called to the character of Mrs. Erlynne in "Lady Windemere's Fan"; her dominant emotion is blackmail; her subsidiary emotions are sacrifice and love. Paula Tanqueray, whose dominant emotion is jealousy, has subsidiary emotions of restlessness and longing. The Rev. Michael Feversham, in "Michael and His Lost Angel" has subsidiary emotions of love, faith and courage; Audrie Lesden, a secondary character, has the dominant emotion of passion and the subsidiary emotions of love, charity and impulsiveness. Becky Warder, in "The Truth," personifying the dominant emotion of lying, constituting the theme of the play, has as subsidiary emotions love, fear, flirtations; her husband, Tom Warder, whose basic emotion is honor, has as subsidiary emotions love, forgiveness and faith. In "The Witching Hour" Jack Brookfield, whose dominant emotion is courage, has the subsidiary emotions of gambling, love and friendship. Wiedemann, a secondary character in "The Vale of Content" has as dominant emotion contentment; subsidiary emotions—peace, love, forgiveness. In "The Red Robe" Etchepare, a secondary character, has as dominant emotion innocence; subsidiary emotions—relentlessness, unforgiving; Mouzon, the basic character, personifying torture, has as subsidiary emotions—lying and lust. In "Know Thyself" Clarisse de Siberan, personifying the basic or dominant emotion of duty, has as secondary emotions longing, jealousy, deception, compassion,

trust, vanity; her husband, a secondary character, whose dominant emotion is tyranny, has as subsidiary emotions—discipline, honor, relentlessness, rage, forgiveness. In "The Cherry Orchard" Madame Ranevsky, the basic character, personifying improvidence, has as subsidiary emotions—prodigality, restlessness, sinfulness, passion, immorality, love, parental. ✓

✓ As indicative of Bernard Shaw's wobbling and lack of continuity and consecutiveness in characterization, let us consider the subsidiary emotions of some of the characters in "Widowers' Houses":—Sartorius, the basic character, personifying the theme of hardness, has as subsidiary emotions stubbornness, tyranny, desire and affection. The last emotion—affection for his daughter—is an outstanding characteristic in opposition to his dominant emotion (hardness). The character of Trench, whose dominant emotion is hypocrisy, has as subsidiary emotions—weakness, deception, nervousness, rashness, dishonorableness. Cokane, whose dominant emotion is diplomacy, has as subsidiary emotions, suavity, faddism, absurdity. Blanche, the daughter of Sartorius, whose dominant emotion is temper, is erratic, hypocritical, deceitful, cruel, stubborn and hateful. Lickcheese, whose dominant emotion is service, has as subsidiary emotions, duty, hardness, scheming, sycophancy and brassiness. In "The Philanderer" Grace Tranfield, whose basic emotion is love, has as subsidiary emotions, passion, tenderness, poise and self-respect. Julia Craven, whose basic emo-

tion is jealousy, has as subsidiary emotions temper, desperation, deception, rage, love.

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession" Vivie, the basic character, whose dominant emotion constitutes the theme morality, has as subsidiary emotions honor, integrity, independence, grit, poise.

It is not scientific playwriting to fasten too many emotions upon a character. Nothing is more calculated to cause confusion in the mind of an audience. ✓

CHAPTER XI

MOTIVATION THROUGH CRUCIBLE, CONFLICT, COMPLICATION AND / OR INTRIGUE TO ULTIMATE CRISIS AND CLIMAX

What is motivation? Motivation is that which pertains to, or identifies motive; that which moves or excites to action. In art: leading idea or conception. In a play the motivation is the proximate or primal cause; it is the metaphysical or psychological thing that produces the chain of causation; it is the causative character in evolutionary action. Mr. Price says ("The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," page 173): "Cause and Effect extends to every fibre of a play. . . . By means of it we get the reason why of everything."

Again, at page 176 he says: "Cause and Effect exists in dramatic form in every part of a good play and it is associated with every principle."

At page 180 he says: "Cause and Effect should be constant; otherwise there would be small or no action."

Goethe is quoted by Barrett H. Clark ("European Theories of the Drama," page 338) as follows: " 'Of motives I distinguish five different varieties:

" '1. *Progressive*, which further the action, and are for the most part employed in drama.

" '2. *Retrogressive*, which draw the action away from its goal; these are almost exclusively confined to epic poetry.

" '3. *Retardative*, which delay the course or lengthen the way; these are used in both kinds of poetry with the greatest advantage.

" '4. *Retrospective*, by means of which events that have happened previously to the epoch of the poem are introduced into it.

" '5. *Anticipatory*, which anticipate that which will happen after the epoch of the poem; the epic poet, as also the dramatic poet, uses both kinds in order to create a perfect poem.' "

Motivation is, in truth, the metaphysical antecedent which creates the psychic echo; it is the impulse or cause which carries the play, by or through the causative character, the length of the organic structure. Consider "As You Like It" from its metaphysical aspect—Rosalind's disguise was not wholly physical; it was metaphysical; it ran through the entire structure of the play; her emotion, to wit, disguise, was part and counterpart of the crucible of the play, *wooing*.

In Pinero's "The Thunderbolt" we have a fine example of motivation. The theme of the play and the metaphysical antecedent is *consideration*, personified in the basic character, Helen Thornhill, an illegitimate child of a dead brother. This consideration, being the causative character or the motivating theme of the play, presents in its development four of the varieties of motive

referred to by Goethe, that is, "progressive," "retardative," "retrospective" and "anticipatory." Helen Thornhill's subsidiary emotions of independence, sacrifice and resentment thread in and out in the development of the story; it is Helen Thornhill's consideration for Phyllis Mortimore and Thaddeus Mortimore, and consideration of the complications which would arise from a perjurious affidavit which causes her to agree to a division of her father's estate, even though the will gave the estate to her in its entirety.

A finely motivated play is Clyde Fitch's play "The Truth." The play "The Madras House" is practically without motivation. "Michael and His Lost Angel" is splendidly motivated—similarly "Strife," by Galsworthy, is a finely motivated play. The reader is invited to trace motivation inductively and deductively to the basic emotion of the basic character.

MOTIVATION THROUGH CRUCIBLE

What is *crucible?* The crucible of a play (sometimes described as the "background" of the play) is the container, the pot, or the furnace in which the play is boiled, baked, stewed or hibernated. This crucible may be creation, life, anything inanimate or animate, physical or metaphysical, emotional or unemotional; it may be an idea, a concept, a point of view; it may be religion, politics, science, war, marriage; in fact any

subject or phase of life, experience, existence or nature.

We have not observed, in any criticism or theory of the drama, consideration or treatment of the definitive concept of crucible in a play, nor is there available any theory or criticism of the element in a play here described or defined as crucible in its relation to the organic structure. Albeit, it would seem that the crucible of a play is one of the most important elements in its organic structure. There is no difficulty in finding the crucible of the play in every well constructed or well made play. It is a distinct, separate and independent constituent element which may be integrated, identified, defined and tagged. There should be, in the very nature of things, in order to secure unity and harmony of expression, direct relation between the basic emotion constituting the theme and the crucible. The selection of a crucible is a matter of moment to the craftsman, for the crucible selected must lend itself and be appropriate to the various other constituent elements of the play. Oftentimes the crucible selected, in a large measure, controls and dominates the other elements of the play. It may be of interest to consider analytically the crucible in a number of plays referred to in this book.—

In "A Doll's House" the crucible is *marriage.* The crucible is directly motivated inductively to Nora and her imprudence in emotional conflict with Torvald's integrity.

The crucible of "Ghosts" is *heritage*, directly motivated to Oswald's dread of the disease (paresis) due to his father's licentiousness.

In "The Master Builder" the crucible is *life in the abstract*, directly motivated through the basic character, Solness, personifying fear. We have in this play a fine illustration of the motivation of life in the abstract, in that "The Master Builder," Halvard Solness, getting old, fears the competition of the younger generation. Fear is motivated deductively through his fear of climbing the tower, which feat was urged upon him by Hilda Wangel, personifying temptation. Metaphorically, Hilda held the apple of life and the old man climbed and fell.

In "Pillars of Society" the crucible is *society in the abstract*, motivated inductively through Karsten Bernick, who personifies deception, the theme of the play. This play is a fine example of satiric writing. Society as his crucible, and as an academic proposition, is shown to be a pot of deception.

In "Hedda Gabler" the crucible is *desperation*, which is also the theme of the play, personified by the basic character, Hedda. The entire play is introspective and the crucible, desperation of the basic character, is a splendid exposition of the surge of a woman's soul in a pot of desperation or despair.

In "The Wild Duck" the crucible is *marriage*, motivated inductively through Hedvig Ekdal, personifying innocence. Here, again, is a fine example of crafts-

manship. The child Hedvig, personifying innocence (the theme of the play) is the victim of a doubtful marriage involving the question of the child's parentage.

In "The League of Youth" the crucible is *egotism* of youth, as indeed is the theme egotism, personified in the young lawyer Stensgard. In this play there is a fine example of the motivation of a theme in a crucible where in the entire surge of the drama is around an egotistical youth.

In "Rosmersholm" the crucible is *superstition*. Here the basic character, Rebecca West, personifying the theme of the play, unscrupulousness, uses the crucible of superstition to influence Rosmer.

In "Polly with a Past" the crucible is *wife-hunting*. Rex, the basic character, personifying desire, wants to marry Myrtle. The interesting psychology of this play is in the development of the plot, wherein it is shown that Rex only thought he loved Myrtle.

In "Pygmalion" the crucible is *phonetics*. The motivation is inductively through Higgins, personifying egotism, much confused, however, with tyranny. This play is particularly interesting in respect to the crucible, for it is an unusual container in which to grind the emotional reaction of a play.

In "The Antigone" of Sophocles, the crucible is the *State*, motivated inductively through Creon, who became King through fate, and who personifies justice.

In "Magda" the crucible is the *family*. This play

is finely drawn in respect to the crucible; it evidences the tyranny of a father and how that tyranny may cause a child to leave the home and how, upon her return, the skeleton in the closet of the family may be uncovered.

In "All God's Chillun Got Wings" the crucible is *race antagonism*, motivated inductively through Ella Downey, personifying hatred.

In "The Magistrate" the crucible is *family life*, motivated inductively through Agatha Posket, personifying deception. This play dramatically visualizes the jarring discord in a family put together through deception.

In "Countess Julia" the crucible is *passion*. In this play the crucible and the theme are the same. The theme, passion, is personified in the Countess Julia, sometimes called "Miss Julie." There is no finer example in any play of the crucible dominating the play. The entire action of the play is a consecutive presentation of the passion of a young woman. The interesting feature of the analysis of "Countess Julia" under the Algebraic Formula is, whereas it has often been stated that Jean, the valet, seduced the Countess Julia, the real fact is (upon analytical analysis of this play) that Julia seduced the valet. On page 56 Jean says:

> Groom's harlot! Shut up and leave the room. Are you coming here to reproach me for being coarse? As vulgarly as you have acted to-night, no one in my class has ever acted. Do you believe a simple girl

would touch a man as you did? Have you ever seen a girl in my class offer herself in that fashion?

Julia says [*completely crushed*]:

That's right; strike me; walk over me; I have deserved nothing better. I am a miserable one; but help me! Help me out of this, if any help is possible!

Jean says [*more softly*]:

I have no wish to waive my share in the honor of having seduced you; but do you believe that any one in my position would have dared to raise his eyes to you, if you had not invited him to do it yourself! I am still dumbfounded——

Julia says:

And proud——

Jean says:

Why not? Although I must confess that the victory was too easy, really, to intoxicate me.

In "The Thunderbolt" the crucible is an *estate.* Helen Thornhill, the basic character, personifying *consideration,* under her father's will is the sole legatee of his estate. The entire play grinds over the distribution of the estate for reasons which will be discussed under the chapter dealing with "Complication."

In "Hindle Wakes" the crucible is *family life.* Nathaniel Jeffcote's boy, Alan, has become involved

with Fanny Hawthorn in a week-end party. Nathaniel Jeffcote personifies integrity. He is the soul of honor and the play grinds in the crucible of family life. There are three families involved—the Hawthorns, the Jeffcotes and the Farrars.

In "The Fugitive" the crucible is *marriage*, a loveless one, motivated inductively through Clare, the basic character, personifying *desperation*.

In "The Pigeon" the crucible is *charity*, motivated inductively through Christopher Wellwyn, personifying charity.

In "The Mob" the crucible is *patriotism*. Stephen More, the basic character, personifying courage, standing by his convictions, encounters the hatred of his neighbors and loses his wife through his pacific tendencies.

In "Justice" the crucible is the *law*. Falder, the basic character, personifying madness, in connection with his interest in Ruth Honeywill, a helpless woman, is, throughout the play, up against the *law*. This play might well be compared with Brieux's play "The Red Robe," where the crucible is the law. It is interesting to note the orientation of the two plays "Justice" and "The Red Robe" in connection with the crucible.

In "Mrs. Dane's Defence" the crucible is *society*, motivated inductively through Mrs. Dane, personifying deception.

In "A False Saint" the crucible is *jealousy*. This play is a fine example of the psychological antecedent

of a basic character motivated through crucible. As a result of Julie's jealousy, which is the container of the play, she personifies penance; her character is introspective; it is psychological; she is penance in emotional re-action to jealousy.

In "The Mollusc" the crucible is *domestic life.* Mrs. Baxter, a tyrannical wife, is about to have her home destroyed through her tyranny as a result of which her husband, through propinquinty, is gradually becoming involved with Miss Roberts.

In "The Lower Depths" the crucible is *lying.* The crucible of this play is a fine example of a play lacking many elements of organic structure, particularly deficient in motivating the plot to the theme; nevertheless, it contains suspense and interest by virtue of the crucible. This play is satire, personified in the basic character Satine. The whole play is a satire on what may be characterized as vicious and virtuous lying.

In "Abie's Irish Rose" the crucible is *family life.*

In "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the crucible is *intrigue,* as is the theme, personified in the basic character, Sir Giles Overreach. This entire play sounds intrigue.

In "As a Man Thinks" the crucible is *marriage.*

In "The Return of Peter Grimm" the crucible is *spiritualism.*

In "Romance" the crucible is *love;* in "The Unchastened Woman, *marriage;* in "Suppressed Desires," *psychoanalysis;* in "Aria da Capo," *love;* in "Cocaine,"

pimping; in "Night," *creation;* in "Enemies," *marriage;* in "The Angel Intrudes," *love;* in "Bound East for Cardiff," the *sea;* in "The Widow's Veil," the *widow's veil;* in "The String of the Samisen," *duty;* in "Not Smart," *innocence;* in "The Servant in the House," the *church;* in "Richelieu," *statecraft;* in "The Clod," the *Civil War;* in "Eugenically Speaking," *selecting a husband;* in "Overtones," *dual personality;* in "Helena's Husband," *suppressed desire;* in "The Trimplet," the *search for happiness;* in "Nevertheless," the *straight and narrow path;* in "The Medicine Show," *laziness;* in "Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil," *keeping faith to obligation of sanctuary.*

In "The Fool," by Channing Pollock, we have an unusual play in respect to crucible. The general crucible may be said to be *life.* There is, however, a distinct crucible in each act, as follows:

Act I. The crucible is the church;
" II. " " " capital and labor;
" III. " " " settlement work;
" IV. " " " peace.

As a general rule, there should never be but *one* crucible in a play. The technique of Mr. Pollock in "The Fool" is unusual and it may be said to be a dramaturgical feat to have carried Gilchrist (personifying sacrifice) through four separate crucibles in a connected and well motivated story.

"In Polly Preferred" the crucible is *business;* in "Capt. Applejack" the crucible is *bachelorhood;* in

"Spreading the News," *gossip;* in "Hyacinth Halvey," *testimonial of character;* in "The Rising of the Moon," *law and order;* in "The Jackdaw," *advising;* in "The Workhouse Ward," *quarrelling;* in "The Traveling Man," *love;* in "The Gaol Gate," *facing one's neighbor;* in "The Three Daughters of Monsieur DuPont," *marriage;* in "Damaged Goods," *syphilis;* in "Maternity" (second version), *womankind;* in "As You Like It," *wooing;* in "The Farmer's Wife," *wooing;* in "Peter Pan," *fairyland;* in "The Judge," by Gorky, the crucible is *sin;* in "Lady Windemere's Fan," *parentage;* in "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," a *woman's past;* in "Michael and His Lost Angel," *love;* in "Strife," *capital and labor;* in "The Madras House," *women;* in "The Hour-Glass," *wisdom;* in "The Truth," *marriage;* in "The Witching Hour," *telepathy* (this play is subject to criticism in having more or less confusion in the crucible; taking the play in its entirety, there is no doubt but telepathy is the crucible, but superstition and hypocrisy are interwoven in such a way that at times the reader is led to believe that either one may be the crucible); in "The Scarecrow" the crucible is *witchcraft;* in "The Weavers" the crucible is *capital* and *labor;* in "The Vale of Content" the crucible is *desire;* in "The Red Robe" the crucible is the *law* (in this play the crucible at times is mixed up with politics—this should not exist); in "Know Thyself" the crucible is *marriage;* in "Pelleas and Melisande" the crucible is *phantasy;* in "Beyond Human Power" the crucible is

miracles; in "The Father" the crucible is *parenthood;* in "The Cherry Orchard" the crucible is *debt;* in "Widowers' House" the crucible is *slum landlordism;* in "The Philanderer" the crucible is *sex* (in this play the crucible is confusing; it may be argued that the crucible is the club, or men and women, or the new woman, or Ibsen; this play, in respect to crucible, is illustrative of Mr. Shaw's disdain of unity of expression in respect to any and every element in a play); in "Mrs. Warren's Profession" the crucible is *motherhood.*

MOTIVATION THROUGH CONFLICT

Conflict is C–2 of the Algebraic Formula. What is meant by conflict? It is essential that we secure accurate terminology. Scientific playwriting requires accurate thinking and expression. Conflict in playwriting should be understood to have relation solely and only to that which is inert and potential. A and B may be in a room; their emotional conflict may be intense—hatred, jealousy, any number of basic emotions may exist; the characters are silent and inert; C enters; A and B give no expression and remain inactive; C may not sense or know that conflict exists. The scientific craftsman deals with conflict in an inert and inactive sense until struggle or combat; then the conflict develops into complication and/or intrigue.

Conflict should not be misunderstood or confused; it is to be contra-distinguished as a separate and dis-

tinct element in the organic structure. Conflict in a scientific or well made play should be constituted of a basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, causatively personified, in correlation to and/or antagonism with another emotion and/or inanimate objects. Conflict only exists when emotion is pitted against emotion. Mr. Ferdinand Brunetiere is said to have originated the postulate that conflict is the basis and law of the drama. This has given rise to endless discussion. Mr. Brunetiere's dictum was antagonized by Mr. Archer, who thought that the basis and law of the drama was *crisis*. Mr. Henry Arthur Jones has attempted to reconcile Mr. Brunetiere and Mr. Archer (see Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," pages 461–469). Mr. Baker (Dramatic Technique," page 44) quotes Mr. Brunetiere as follows: " 'Drama is the representation of the will of man in contrast to the mysterious powers of natural forces which limit and belittle us; it is one of us thrown living upon the stage, there to struggle against fatality, against social law, against one of his fellow mortals, against himself, if need be, against the emotions, the interests, the prejudices, the folly, the malevolence of those around him.' "

This statement of Mr. Brunetiere is likewise referred to by Mr. Archer in his work on "Play-Making," at page 28. Mr. Brunetiere is further quoted as follows: " 'The theatre in general,' . . . 'is nothing but the place for the development of the human will, attacking

the obstacles opposed to it by destiny, fortune, or circumstances.' "

Mr. Archer says at page 36: "Perhaps we shall scarcely come nearer to a helpful definition than if we say that the essence of drama is *crisis*."

Mr. Wilde, in his book "The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play," ignores, in so far as specific or concrete consideration is concerned, Mr. Brunetiere's so-called "The Law of the Drama."

Mr. Charlton Andrews in his "Technique of Playwriting," page 24, quotes Mr. Brunetiere as follows: " 'One other law is no less essential; it is that which indicates that an action in the theatre must be conducted by wills, if not always free, always at least self-conscious. . . . This law is nothing more than the expression . . . of that which in the very definition of the theatre is essential, peculiar, and, to repeat, absolutely specific. . . . That which peculiarly belongs only to the theatre, that which through all literatures, from the Greek to our own, forms the permanent and continued unity of the dramatic species, is the spectacle of a will which unfolds itself;—and that is why action, and action thus defined, will always be the law of the theatre.' "

Mr. Price, in his "The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," page 124, does not discuss conflict in the phraseology of Mr. Brunetiere, but as *action;* he says: "It is the overcoming of some obstacle and, of course, our doubt. . . . It is something

in solution all the time. . . . It must always exist at the present moment."

Again he says: "Every discussion between people who misunderstand each other is Action. There is usually some misconstruction—some misunderstanding —some impediment—"

Again at page 126 he says: "Observe that Action does not need to be violent or explosive, for drama includes placid as well as the intensely melodramatic and tragic."

At page 140 he says: "Life is made up of right and wrong, and wherever it is involved we stop, even if it is on a street corner, and listen."

We submit that it is necessary that the playwright establish in his own mind the specific and concrete conception and understanding of conflict. The authorities are not particularly helpful; there is much confusion in terminology and classification.

Mr. Henry Arthur Jones is quoted in Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 469, as follows: " 'Drama arises when any person or persons in a play are consciously or unconsciously "up against" some antagonistic person, or circumstance, or fortune. It is often more intense, when as in Œdipus, the audience is aware of the obstacle, and the person himself or persons on the stage are unaware of it. Drama arises thus, and continues when or till the person or persons are aware of the obstacle; it is sustained so long as we watch the reaction physical, mental, or

spiritual, of the person or persons to the opposing person, or circumstance, or fortune. It relaxes as this reaction subsides, and ceases when the reaction is complete. This reaction of a person to an obstacle is most arresting and intense when the obstacle takes the form of another human will in almost balanced collision."

Conflict, as understood, or as it should be understood in the organic structure of a play, may be described as the ingots or pawns that are fed into the crucible, the furnace or pot, as it were, in which the thing—A PLAY, THE PLAY—is to be melted, stewed, baked or boiled. The material which is fed into the crucible or pot is animate and/or inanimate. It must necessarily consist of the basic character who is in conflict emotionally with himself, or with nature, or with any one or more of the thousand conflicting elements constituting the fabric of human emotions. The conflicting emotions are, or should be, personified in the secondary characters in the play (a more particular description and analysis of secondary characters being contained in the chapter on "Incidental Detailed Construction," element F–1). Let us give a concrete illustration: Assume that the basic emotion or theme selected by the playwright is *hatred;* that the basic character personifies hatred; that a crucible has been selected in which this basic emotion hatred is to be germinated and dramaturgically expressed—it then becomes important for the playwright to elect or select the elements which he intends placing in the crucible

constituting the conflict; these elements must be elements motivated upon or in relation to the basic emotion hatred. The elements placed in the pot must be elements that will inevitably tend to develop the playwright's conception and orientation of his basic emotion. Hatred may, and does, arise from a multitude of causes; these causes project themselves into human consciousness, either internally or externally, and create the psychic emotion hatred. The playwright's logic and development may be either deductive or inductive. It is the playwright's duty, however, by process of selection and elimination, to determine the particular elements constituting the conflict, having in mind always motivating these elements through the crucible, through the basic character, to the basic emotion. Assume, for the purpose of illustration, that the play is being orientated from the idea of humiliation, which in and of itself is a basic emotion—if the basic emotion of the play is hatred and this hatred is metaphysically due to the experience which caused the basic character to be humiliated, it becomes essential that the conflict in the crucible should be constituted of an element, or elements, involving humiliation to the basic character; this carries the motivation inductively to the basic theme. Other characters in the crucible constituting the conflict may, or may not, personify hatred, or any other emotion which the playwright conceives may lend character or color to his play. The elements of conflict should be constituted of an emotion, or emo-

tions, collateral to, or in opposition to the basic emotion hatred. In other words, the elements which are put into the crucible constituting the conflict must, or should be, elements which will inevitably tend to create complication and/or intrigue, which is the next element to be discussed in the Algebraic Formula.

In "A Doll's House" Nora, the basic character, personifying *imprudence,* was placed in a crucible in opposition to Torvald, her husband, who personified integrity, and Krogstad, who personified desperation.

Some of the authorities cited maintain that the play "Othello" does not contain conflict. We submit that it does. The basic emotion of "Othello" is jealousy, personified by Othello. The crucible of the play "Othello" is marriage. The play is orientated from the basic emotion jealousy. Othello, the Moor with a black skin, married Desdemona, a Caucasian. Into the crucible Shakespeare placed Iago, a jealous, cunning and subtle individual, in addition to other elements and characters. All of these elements constitute the finest material for conflict and resulted in one of the strongest plays in literature. Let us trace the elements of conflict by way of illustration in other distinctive plays:

In "The Servant in the House" the elements of conflict are: the three brothers, consisting of the Rev. William Smythe, the vicar, the basic character of the play, personifying *hypocrisy;* Robert Smith, the drainman, personifying *sacrifice;* the Bishop of Benares, known

as "the servant in the house," personifying *brotherhood;* the Bishop of Lancashire, personifying *hypocrisy;* Auntie, the vicar's wife, personifying *hypocrisy;* Mary, the drainman's daughter, personifying *wishing.* The inanimate conflict in "The Servant in the House" is the symbolized drainpipe, representing the hypocritical church.

In "A False Saint" the elements of conflict are: Julie, the basic character, personifying *penance;* Jeanne, the widow of Henri, personifying forgiveness; Christine, the daughter of Jeanne, personifying *morality;* Georges Pierrard, fiancé of Christian, personifying immorality. The inanimate elements in conflict are: the convent, conscience and memory.

In "Hindle Wakes" the conflict is between Nathaniel Jeffcote, the basic character, personifying *integrity;* Alan Jeffcote, his son, personifying *lust;* Fanny Hawthorn, personifying *sporting;* Christopher and his wife, personifying *parental;* Mrs. Jeffcote, personifying *snobbishness;* Beatrice Farrar, personifying *sacrifice.* The inanimate elements are: life in the mill town of Hindle; its environments; the week-end resort; elements of nature; passion; psychology.

In "As a Man Thinks" the conflict is between Dr. Seelig, the basic character, personifying *forgiveness;* Vedah, his daughter, personifying *love;* Mrs. Clayton, personifying *neglect;* Julian Burrill, personifying *love;* Benjamin DeLota, personifying *deception;* Frank Clayton, personifying *disloyalty;* Mrs. Seelig, personify-

ing *maternity;* Judge Hoover, personifying *prejudice.*

In "The Return of Peter Grimm" the elements in conflict consist of Peter Grimm, the basic character, personifying *planning;* Frederik, his nephew, personifying *deception;* James Hartman, personifying *love;* Andrew MacPherson, personifying *faith;* William, personifying *innocence;* Catherine, personifying *love;* Marta, personifying *service.*

In "Romance" the elements of conflict are: Bishop Armstrong, personifying *romance;* Cornelius VanTuyl, personifying *friendship;* Harry, personifying *love;* Signora Vannucci, personifying *service,* Mrs. Rutherford, Mrs. Frothingham, Mrs. Gray and Miss Frothingham, personifying *gossip;* Mme. Margherita Cavallini, personifying *sacrifice.*

In "The Unchastened Woman" the elements of conflict are: Caroline Knollys, the basic character, personifying *vanity;* Hubert Knollys, her husband, personifying *unfaithfulness;* Susan Ambie, personifying *friendship;* Lawrence Sanbury, personifying *naïveness;* Hildegarde Sanbury, personifying *honesty;* Emily Madden, personifying *deception;* Michael Krellin, personifying *fanaticism.*

In "The Three Daughters of Monsieur DePont" the conflict is between the three daughters, Caroline, Julie and Angele, the basic characters, personifying the basic emotion *longing;* Courthezon, personifying *deception;* Monsieur DuPont, personifying *vanity;* M. and Mme.

Mairaut, personifying *trading;* Antonin Mairaut, personifying *selfishness.*

In the one-act plays by Lady Gregory we have, in "Spreading the News," the basic character Bartley Fallon, personifying *pessimism,* in conflict with Mrs. Fallon; Early Casey, Ryan, Tarpey and Tully, personifying *gossip;* Jack Smith, personifying *happiness;* the Magistrate, personifying *inquisition.*

In "Hyacinth Halvey" we have Hyacinth Halvey, the basic character, personifying *wickedness;* Quirke, the butcher, personifying *dishonesty;* Farrell, the telegraph boy, personifying *suggestion;* Mrs. Delane, personifying *gossip;* Miss Joyce, personifying *friendship.*

In "The Rising of the Moon" the elements of conflict are between the Sergeant, personifying *consideration;* Policeman X and Policeman B, personifying *lawfulness;* the ragged man, personifying *lawlessness.*

In "The Jackdaw" the conflict is between the basic character, Joseph Nestor, personifying *advising;* Cooney, personifying *distrust;* Mrs. Broderick, personifying *distraction;* Nally, personifying *penury;* Fahy, personifying *credulity.*

In "The Workhouse Ward" the conflict is between the basic characters McInerney and Miskell, personifying *quarrelling;* Mrs. Donohoe, personifying *sanctuary.*

In "The Trimplet" the conflict is between the basic characters Caratina and Milton-Maurice, personifying *love;* Lady Bobolara and the Marquess of Strenathco,

personifying *hate;* the person passing by, personifying *faith.*

In "Nevertheless" the conflict is between the girl, personifying *integrity,* and the boy, personifying *anger,* the burglar, personifying *doubt.*

In "The Clod" the conflict is between Mary Trask, the basic character, personifying *desperation;* Thaddeus Trask, personifying *ignorance;* a northern soldier, personifying *patriotism;* a southern sergeant and Dick, personifying *pursuit.*

In "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the elements of conflict are: Sir Giles Overreach, personifying *intrigue;* Frank Wellborn, personifying *confidence;* Tom Allworth, personifying *gratitude;* Greedy, personifying *greed;* Marrall, personifying *deceit;* Margaret, personifying *modesty;* and other elements in conflict of less importance.

In "Richelieu" the elements of conflict are: Richelieu, the basic character, personifying *ambition;* Louis the Thirteenth, personifying *majesty;* Gaston, Duke of Orleans, personifying *treachery;* Baradas, personifying *conspiracy;* DeMauprat, personifying *love;* DeBeringhen, personifying *conspiracy;* Huguet, personifying *spying;* Julie DeMortemar, personifying *love;* Marion deLomare, personifying *deception;* and other secondary characters of less importance.

In "The Pigeon" the elements in conflict are: Christopher Wellwyn, personifying *charity;* Ann, his

daughter, personifying *protest;* Guinevere Megan, personifying *wantonness;* Rory Megan, personifying *gambling;* Ferrand, personifying *vagabondage;* Timson, personifying *desire;* a police constable, personifying *duty,* and other secondary characters of less importance.

In "The Wild Duck" the elements in conflict are: Hedvig, personifying *innocence;* Werle, Sr., personifying *corruption;* Gregers, his son, personifying *integrity;* Old Ekdal, personifying *illusion;* Hialmar Ekdal, personifying *integrity;* Gina Ekdal, personifying *deception;* Mrs. Sorby, personifying *frankness;* Dr. Relling, personifying *understanding;* Molvik, personifying *despair.*

In "Ghosts" the elements of conflict are: Oswald, personifying *dread;* Mrs. Alving, personifying *fear;* Pastor Manders, personifying *duty;* Jacob Engstrand, personifying *deceit.*

In "All God's Chillun Got Wings" the elements in conflict are: Ella Downey, the basic character, personifying *hatred;* Jim Harris, personifying *ambition;* Hattie, personifying *defiance;* and other secondary characters of less importance.

In "As You Like It" the elements of conflict are: the Senior Duke, personifying *goodness;* the usurping Duke Frederick, personifying *envy;* Oliver, personifying *hate;* Jacques, personifying *melancholy;* Orlando, personifying *love;* Touchstone, personifying *satire;* Corin, personifying *contentment;* Silvius, personifying

love; William, personifying *love;* Rosalind, personifying *disguise;* Celia, personifying *friendship;* Phebe, a shephardess, personifying *sternness.*

In "Peter Pan" the elements of conflict are: Peter Pan, personifying *illusion;* the Indians, the pirates, the father and the mother, Wendy and the children, personifying *illusion.*

In "The League of Youth" the conflict is between Stensgard, personifying *egotism;* Chamberlain Bratsberg, personifying *integrity;* his son, Erik Bratsberg, personifying *deception;* Mons Monsen, personifying *deception;* Ringdal, personifying *service;* Ludestad, personifying *regularity;* Daniel Heire, personifying *litigiousness.*

In "Rosmersholm" the elements in conflict consist of Rebecca West, personifying *unscrupulousness,* pitted emotionally against Johannes Rosmer, personifying *honor;* Rector Kroll, personifying *friendship;* Ulric Brendel and Peter Mortensgard, personifying *emancipation;* Madam Helseth, personifying *service.*

In "The Master Builder" Halvard Solness, the Master Builder, personifying *fear,* is pitted emotionally against Hilda Wangel, personifying *temptation;* Aline Solness, personifying *obedience;* Knut Brovik and Ragnar Brovik, each personifying *service.*

In "Pillars of Society" the basic character, Karsten Bernick, personifying *deception,* is pitted emotionally against Mrs. Bernick, personifying *loyalty;* Martha Bernick, personifying *friendship;* Johan Tonnesen,

personifying *sacrifice;* Lona Hessel, personifying *truth;* Dina Dorf, personifying *freedom;* Rummel, Vigeland and Sandstad, personifying *hypocrisy;* Krap and Aune, personifying *resentment;* Mrs. Rummel, Hilda Rummel, Mrs. Holt, Netta Holt and Mrs. Lynge, personifying *gossip.*

In "Hedda Gabler" the basic character, Hedda Gabler, personifying *desperation,* is pitted emotionally against George Tesman, personifying *cowardice;* Juliana Tesman, personifying *kindness;* Mrs. Elvsted, personifying *courage;* Judge Brack, personifying *tyranny,* and Eilert Lovborg, personifying *desire.*

In "The Antigone" of Sophocles, Creon, the king, personifying *justice,* is pitted emotionally against Antigone, personifying *defiance;* Ismene, personifying *acquiescence;* Haemon, personifying *resentment;* Teiresias, personifying *prophecy;* Eurydice, personifying *freedom.*

In "Suppressed Desires" the elements of conflict are between Henrietta Brewster, personifying *delusion,* pitted emotionally against Stephen Brewster, personifying *remonstrance,* and Mabel, personifying *faith.*

In "Aria da Capo" Pierrot, the basic character, personifying *illusion,* is pitted emotionally against Columbine, personifying *love;* Cothurnus, Thyrsis and Corydon, personifying *playing.*

In "Cocaine" Nora, the basic character, personifying *love,* is pitted emotionally against Joe, personifying *pimping.*

In "Night" the woman personifying *rebellion*, is pitted emotionally against the scientist, personifying *calculation;* the poet, personifying *love;* the priest, personifying *ministry;* the man, personifying *dependence.*

In "Enemies" the basic character He, personifying *idealism*, is pitted emotionally against She, personifying *prosaicism.*

In "The Angel Intrudes" Jimmy, personifying *love*, is pitted emotionally against the Angel, personifying *guardianship;* Annabelle, personifying *fickleness.*

In "The String of the Samisen" Tama, the basic character, personifying *sacrifice*, is pitted emotionally against Katsu Mori, personifying *honor;* Okubo, personifying *love;* Sutsumi, personifying *superstition;* Hatsu, personifying *service.*

In "The Fugitive" Clare, the basic character, personifying *desperation*, is pitted emotionally against her husband, George Dedmond, personifying *prosaicism;* General Dedmond, personifying *indecision;* Lady Dedmond personifying *decision;* Edward Fullarton, personifying *susceptibility;* Dorothy Fullarton, personifying *friendship;* Twisden, personifying *conciliation;* Malise, personifying *irony.*

In "Justice" Falder, the basic character, personifying *madness*, is pitted emotionally against James How, personifying *hardness;* Walter How, personifying *mercy;* Cokeson, personifying *consecutiveness;* Wister, personifying *relentlessness;* Justice Floyd, personifying

justice; Ruth Honeywell, personifying *helplessness.*

In "Polly with a Past" Rex Van Zile, the basic character, personifying *desire,* is pitted emotionally against Richardson, personifying *friendship;* Prentice Van Zile, personifying *bribery;* Stiles, personifying *submission;* Collum, personifying *friendship;* Polly Shannon, personifying *ambition;* Mrs. Van Zile, personifying *aristocracy;* Myrtle Davis, personifying *faddism.*

In "The Thunderbolt" Helen Thornhill, the basic character, personifying *consideration,* is pitted emotionally against James Mortimore and his wife Ann, personifying *greed;* Stephen Mortimore and his wife Louisa, personifying *greed;* Thaddeus Mortimore, personifying *sacrifice;* Phyllis, his wife, personifying *remorse;* Col. Ponting and his wife Rose, personifying *greed;* Mr. Vallance and Mr. Elkin, personifying *advising.*

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the conflict is between innocence, personified in Lady Windemere; Lord Windemere and Lord Darlington, each personifying *love;* Mrs. Erlynne, personifying *blackmail;* the Duchess of Berwick, personifying *gossip.*

In "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," *jealousy,* the basic theme, personified in Paula, is in conflict with *love,* personified by Aubrey Tanqueray; *purity,* by Ellean, Aubrey's child by a first wife; *friendship,* personified by Cayley Drummle, Mrs. Cortelyou, Dr. Gordon Jayne and Misquith; *courage,* personified by Capt. Hugh Ardale.

In "Michael and His Lost Angel" *penance*, personified in the Rev. Michael Feversham, is in conflict with *passion*, personified by Audrie Lesden; *penance*, personified by Rose Gibbard; Father Hilary, personifying *ministry; gratitude* personified by Andrew Gibbard.

In "Strife" the basic emotion, *hardness*, personified in John Anthony, is in conflict with *stubbornness*, personified by David Roberts and the striking workmen at the Tin Plate Works. Green, Bulgin, Thomas and Rous personify *conciliation*. Edgar Anthony and the directors personify *conciliation*.

In "The Madras House" the conflict is divided into primary, secondary and tertiary action. The primary conflict is the basic character morality against father, mother and wife. The secondary conflict involves Miss Yates, Miss Chancellor and the Brigstocks. Incidentally, State and Thomas, the tertiary conflict and farthest related from the primary action, is that involving the Huxtables, father, mother and six daughters.

In "The Hour-Glass" the conflict is between desire, the basic character, a wise man, the fool and the angel.

In "Riders to the Sea" *sacrifice*, personified in Maurya, the old woman, in conflict with Bartley, her son, personifying *duty;* Cathleen and Nora, her daughters, personifying *consideration;* men and women, personifying *friends*.

In "The Truth" *lying*, personified by Becky Warder, the basic character, is in conflict with *jealousy*, per-

sonified by Eve Lindon; *wickedness*, personified by Fred Lindon; *honor*, personified by Tom Warder; *sporting*, personified by Roland; *friendship*, personified by Laura Fraser; *longing*, personified by Mrs. Crespigny.

In "The Great Divide" the emotional conflict is between *hardness*, the basic character, personified by Stephen Ghent; *sacrifice*, personified by Ruth Jordan; *love*, personified by Winthrop Newbury; *ruffianism*, personified by Dutch and a Mexican; *brotherliness*, personified by Philip Jordan; *parental*, personified by Mrs. Jordan; *kindness*, personified by Dr. Newbury.

In "The Witching Hour" *courage*, personified by Jack Brookfield, is in emotional conflict with *revenge*, personified by Frank Hardmuth; *love*, personified by Mrs. Whipple; *gambling*, personified by Lew Ellinger; *superstition*, personified by Clay Whipple; *justice*, personified by Prentice; *counselling*, personified by Col. Bayley.

In "The Scarecrow" *illusion*, personified by Lord Ravensbane, is in emotional conflict with *mysticism*, personified by Goody Rickby; *mysticism*, personified by Dickon; *love*, personified by Rachel Merton; *love*, personified by Richard Talbot.

In "The Weavers" the emotional conflict is between *hardness*, personified in Dreissiger; *hardness*, personified in Pfeifer, his manager, and the variant emotions of the mob.

In "The Vale of Content" *longing*, personified in

Elizabeth, is in emotional conflict with *contentment*, personified in her husband, Wiedemann; *love*, personified in Helene; *lust*, personified in VonRoecknitz; *egotism*, personified in Frau Orb; *friendship*, personified in Dangel.

In "The Red Robe" the basic emotion, *torture*, personified by Mouzon, is in emotional conflict with *integrity*, personified by Vagret; *innocence*, personified in Etchepare; *judging*, personified by La Bouzule and Bunerat; *mercy*, personified in Ardeuil; *ambition*, personified in Madame Vagret; *integrity*, personified in Placat; *revenge*, personified in Yanetta.

In "Know Thyself" *duty*, personified by Clarisse de Siberan, is in conflict with *tyranny*, personified by General de Siberan; *passion*, personified by Jean and Anna; *affection*, personified by Pavail; *forgiveness*, personified by Doncieres.

In "Pelleas and Melisande" *innocence*, personified by Melisande, is in emotional conflict with *love*, personified by Pelleas; *jealousy*, personified by Golaud.

In "Beyond Human Power" *faith*, personified by Pastor Sang, is in emotional conflict with doubters.

In "The Father" *madness*, personified by a cavalry captain, is in conflict with *tyranny*, personified by Laura, his wife; *innocence*, personified by Bertha, their daughter; *advising*, personified by Dr. Ostermark; *ministry*, personified by the Pastor; *passion*, personified by Nojd.

In "The Cherry Orchard" *improvidence*, personified

by Madame Ranevsky, is in emotional conflict with Lopakhin, personifying *advising;* Leonid Gayef, personifying *gossip;* Barbara, personifying *service;* Charlotte, personifying *loneliness.* This play "The Cherry Orchard" illustrates most emphatically irrelevant conflict. The strongest phase of conflict is between Madame Ranevsky, personifying *improvidence* and Lopakhin, personifying *advising.* Lopakhin is the merchant who bought Madame Ranevsky's property at auction under foreclosure. This play will be referred to under "Complication and Crisis." The conflict is strongest in its introspective aspects, the strongest emotional conflict being in Madame Ranevsky's character; she is improvident, prodigal, reckless, sinful, passionate, immoral, loving and parental.

In "Widowers' Houses" *hardness,* personified by Sartorius, is in conflict with *hypocrisy,* personified by Trench; *diplomacy,* personified by Cokane; *temper,* personified by Blanche; *service,* personified by Lickcheese.

In "The Philanderer" *philandering,* personified by Charteris, is in emotional conflict with *jealousy,* personified by Julia Craven; *poise,* personified by Grace Tranfield; *impudence,* personified by Sylvia; *ministering,* personified by Dr. Paramore; *friendship,* personified by Craven and Cuthbertson.

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession" *morality,* personified by Vivie, is in emotional conflict with *immorality,* personified by Mrs. Warren; *hypocrisy,* personified by

Rev. Samuel Gardner; *sporting*, personified by Frank Gardner; Crofts, personifying *dishonor;* Praed, personifying *friendship.*

In "Arms and the Man" *adventure*, personified by Bluntschli, is in emotional conflict with *romance*, personified by Raina; *rashness*, personified by Saranoff; *jealousy*, personified by Louka; *service*, personified by Nicola; *parental*, personified by Major and Catherine Petkoff.

In "Candida" *sacrifice*, personified by Candida, is in emotional conflict with *poetic*, personified by Marchbanks; *integrity*, personified by Rev. Morell; *prosaic*, personified by Proserpine; *opportunist*, personified by Burgiss.

MOTIVATION THROUGH COMPLICATION

As we have heretofore indicated, conflict exists inert and potential. The elements of conflict in life do not become dramatic until they develop into derivative situations, episodes, events or incidents constituting complication and/or intrigue, that is, emotion in action, rebellion or antagonism. For many years before the World War the elements of conflict were in existence; the conflict was incubating; the elements of conflict were known to exist; nevertheless, until the war broke, complication did not arise or ensue.

Complication is the thing that makes for story and plot; it is the grinding, the struggle, the battle, the blows given and taken by those elements in conflict.

When the craftsman has selected the crucible of his play and the respective elements of conflict, he must then determine and invent the complication and/or intrigue. It is the complication and/or intrigue and the succeeding crises culminating in the supreme crisis which constitute the derivative situations, that is, episodes, events, altercations, accidents, incidents, provocations; in other words, element "E" of the Algebraic Formula.

The complication and/or intrigue in a logical and scientific play must be motivated inductively to the basic emotion constituting the theme. The majority of plays do not contain intrigue, and very few plays contain interesting and emphatic complication. Thin or slight complication makes doubtful drama. The more emphatic or intense the complication and/or intrigue, the more perfect the play, for it is invariably true that it is the complication and/or intrigue that causes movement in the play and which creates in the minds of the audience a disposition to take sides and pull or root for various characters in the play. It is in complication and/or intrigue that the craftsman finds most fertile soil for ingenuity and for inventive genius.

The complication and/or intrigue may be stock and common or original. As a matter of fact, in most plays the complication and/or intrigue is common and ordinary, for it is easier to pull down these wares from the dramatic shelf than to labor in the invention of original episodes (if there is such a thing as an

original episode). Whenever the episode, or, as we prefer to say, derivative situation, is in the public domain, it is free to every craftsman. The craftsman, however, may not, in writing his play, appropriate the designed sequence of connected events, or the combination of incidents, or the causative chain of sequential events. This question will be discussed at length under the chapter pertaining to infringement and piracy.

The greater the degree of inventiveness and originality in the complication and/or intrigue, the more entertaining and receptive the play. Playwrights most often prefer to adhere to true and tried episodes which have, from time immemorial, aroused the emotions of an audience. This is what is known as "sure-fire stock situations." In the play by Channing Pollock entitled "The Fool" the important element creating interest and arousing the emotions of the audience is the complication and/or intrigue created by Jerry Goodkind and Joe Hennig who, either wittingly or unwittingly, from time to time in the play lend themselves in fastening upon Daniel Gilchrist (the basic character, personifying *sacrifice*) the stain of philandering. Charging a minister with immorality is certain to arouse interest in the common herd of mankind.

We do not contend that a play must necessarily register strongly either the element of complication and/or intrigue or crisis (which is discussed in the succeeding chapter), as there are many plays which have been

more or less successful in which the complication and/or intrigue is slight indeed. The thing that we do argue is, that there is no element in the organic structure of a play which creates in the mind of an audience more intense interest and suspense than the element of complication and/or intrigue. This element also lends to the story and plot. A play without complication and/or intrigue cannot, in the very nature of things, contain very much of a plot.

We do not find in either Mr. Baker's book entitled "Dramatic Technique," or Mr. Archer's book entitled "Play-Making" any consideration given to either complication and/or intrigue. Mr. Wilde ("The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play") page 106, conceives of complication as introducing a second action, or a second theme, or a second angle upon the point at issue and says it is essential to give the play persuasiveness of life.

There *should not be* a second action and *will not be* if the craftsman understands his theme and basic character. Complication does not, in a well-made play, introduce a second action, or a second theme for complication is motivated inductively to the basic emotion, or deductively from the basic emotion.

In a logical play the effect or result of a primal emotion pitted against another emotion will, in logical sequence, inevitably produce complication and/or intrigue. The elements placed in the crucible, if dramatically selected, will, in the very nature of things,

when they begin to grind, struggle or hibernate, produce complication. Mr. Charlton Andrews ("Technique of Playwriting," page 63) devotes a chapter to outlining the elements of complication.

A few illustrative examples of complication will suffice to illustrate the motivation through the various elements to complication:—

"Countess Julia"—Basic theme passion; personified in Julia; crucible passion; conflict with Jean finds its tensest complication in Julia's seduction of Jean. Jean says to Julia:

> Groom's harlot! Shut up and leave the room. Are you coming here to reproach me for being coarse? As vulgarly as you have acted tonight, no one in my class has ever acted. Do you believe a simple girl would touch a man as you did? Have you ever seen a girl in my class offer herself in that fashion?

Julia says [*completely crushed*]:

> That's right! strike me; walk over me; I have deserved nothing better. I am a miserable one; but help me! Help me out of this, if any help is possible!

Jean [*more softly*]:

> I have no wish to waive my share in the honor of having seduced you; but do you believe that any one in my position would have dared to raise his eyes to you, if you had not invited him to do it yourself! I am still dumbfounded——

Again Julia says [*screams*]:

O, kill me, too! Kill me! If you can kill an innocent creature without having your hand tremble! Oh! I hate and abhor you. There is blood between us. I curse the hour when I first saw you, I curse the hour when I was born.

Jean says:

A lot of good this cursing will do you. Let's go!

Julia: [*She draws close to the block, being drawn there against her will.*]

No, I do not want to go yet; I cannot; I must see—Pst! A carriage is passing outside. [*She listens, while her eyes are intently fixed upon the block and the knife.*] Do you suppose I cannot stand the sight of blood? Do you suppose I am so weak— Oh—I would like to see your blood and your brains on this block. I would like to see your entire sex swimming in a pool like that. I believe I could drink out of your skull, bathe my feet in your chest and eat your heart fried! You think I am weak; you think I love you; you think I would carry your brood under my heart and nourish it with my blood—bring forth your child and bear your name? Tell me, what *is* your name? I never heard your surname—I don't suppose you have one? I am to become Mrs. "Housewatchman," or Madame "Yardsweeper"—you puppy, who wear my collar; you serf, who wear my coat-of-arms on your buttons,—I am to share you with my cook, become a rival to my maid! Oh, oh, oh! You think I am a coward and wanted to fly! No, now I remain here—and let the storm come! My father will come home—find his secretary broken open, his money stolen! Then he rings—with the bell—twice

for the servant—and then sends for the magistrate—and I will tell everything. Everything! Oh, it will be good to make an end of it all—if it only would come to an end!— . . . And then the entire business will be at an end—and peace and quiet will come! Eternal peace! And the coat-of-arms will be broken over his coffin—the noble race has died out—and the servant's offspring will grow up in an orphanage—win his laurels in the gutter and end in prison!

Christina enters on the right dressed for church, prayer book in her hand]:

Julia [*hastens toward her and falls into her arms, as if seeking protection*]:

Help me, Christina! Help me against this man here!

Here, indeed, is complication in the most tense degree. Countess Julia, as a result of her basic emotion (passion) seduced her man-servant as a direct result of her passion. This conflict and the complication which ensues is intense.

In "Mrs. Dane's Defence" Mrs. Dane personifies the basic emotion deception; she is endeavoring to marry into society (the crucible). As a result of her deception, she encounters in the conflict Sir Daniel Carteret. Sir Daniel Carteret personifies inquisition. The complication which her deception brings about is vividly and dramatically intensified in the famous Third Act, where Sir Daniel Carteret examines and cross-examines Mrs. Dane. The motivation of this complication inductively to the basic emotion (decep-

tion) is magnificent. After inquisition and the web of deceit is constantly being drawn more tightly around Mrs. Dane, Sir Daniel Carteret says:

> Woman, you are lying!

Mrs. Dane says:

> How dare you! How dare you!

Sir Daniel:

> I say you're lying! You are Felicia Hindemarsh.

This brings the play to the crisis, which will be referred to in the next chapter.

In the play "A False Saint," Act II, Julie creates for herself a complication in intriguing against Christine. Her intrigue here, however, is the result of a subsidiary emotion, jealousy. Complication should not ensue from a subsidiary emotion; it should come from the primal stream. Julie undertakes to make Christine the victim of her jealousy. Julie's basic emotion is penance and the motivation of this episode partially furnishes the reason for Julie's return to the convent. Julie tells Christine that Christine's fiancé, Monsieur Pierrard, has in hand an affair. Christine's emotion is morality—naturally Christine revolts at Pierrard's disloyalty.

In "Hindle Wakes" there is fine complication when Alan Jeffcote week-ends with Fanny Hawthorn and his week-end joy-ride is brought home to Fanny's

parents and through Fanny's parents to Alan's father. This complication results in the breaking of Alan's engagement to Beatrice Farrar.

In "The Magistrate" the complication becomes emphatic and intense in the Second Act, the scene being the supper-room in the Hotel des Princes. The tenseness of this play is in the complication and intrigue evidenced in the supper-room, where the various elements of conflict have been brought together.

In "Othello" the complication of the play revolves around the discovery by Othello, through the incident of the handkerchief, of Desdemona's supposed unfaithfulness, which caused Othello to strangle her to death.

In "Abie's Irish Rose" Solomon's love of race and religion creates a barrier or hurdle and brings about the complication that grows more tense in each succeeding episode. The two characters Solomon and Patrick are torn between love and hate.

In "The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle," by Price, at page 17 is set forth the principles which the author undertakes to treat separately. Nowhere does Mr. Price discuss complication and/or intrigue—at least under that terminology. Nevertheless, Mr. Price uses, among the four plays selected, Philip Massinger's play "A New Way to Pay Old Debts"; this play is used as a matrix to evidence organic structure and, when subjected to the Algebraic Formula, shows that the basic emotion or theme is intrigue. The elements of conflict have heretofore been

set forth. The complication which ensues as a result of the intrigue of Sir Giles Overreach is motivated in the incident of intriguing Wellborn out of his property. The tense moment is shown by Marrall through the exposure of a razed deed.

The complication and/or intrigue in this play "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" is registered definitively. It is Sir Giles' intrigue to secure the fortune of his nephew (Wellborn), his intrigue to secure the fortune of Lady Allworth, and his intrigue to have Lord Lovell marry his daughter Margaret, in order that she may have place and power, that leads to his undoing. This play is a fine example of complication and/or intrigue because, as a matter of fact, the basic emotion is intrigue. The personification of that basic emotion in Sir Giles Overreach is motivated all through the play, the crucible being intrigue, the conflict constituting intrigue, and the complication being the result of intrigue.

In "The Mollusc" the complication consists of propinquity between Mr. Baxter and Miss Roberts; affection arising on the part of Tom for Miss Roberts; Tom fighting the tyranny of his sister, Mrs. Baxter; Mrs. Baxter's awakening to the result of her tyranny and forced propinquity between her husband and the Governess.

In "The Wild Duck" the complication arises between Gina, personifying deception (she having been kept by Werle, Sr., who personifies corruption), and Hialmar, personifying justice, Hialmar coming to the

belief that Hedvig, his supposed daughter, was, in reality, the child of Werle, Sr., and Gina. Here we have the emotion deception in struggle with the emotion justice, and innocence being ground between the upper and nether millstone.

In "As a Man Thinks" the complication arises first in respect to Veda and Burrill, both of whom personify love. As a matter of fact, it was intended by the author to orientate this play on inter-racial marriage. Dr. Seelig, the Jewish father, personifies forgiveness. The author lost his point of orientation, however, and allowed the play to develop into a complication between Frank Clayton and his wife and Benjamin DeLota, resulting in the ordinary triangle play, Frank Clayton personifying disloyalty, Mrs. Clayton personifying neglect, and Benjamin DeLota personifying deception. Mrs. Clayton became involved with DeLota; her home was about to be destroyed and was saved by the intervention of Dr. Seelig, who personified forgiveness. In this play the author uses a child, personifying innocence, in order to accentuate the complication between Frank Clayton and his wife and to bring about forgiveness. As a matter of fact, the child is irrelevant to the play.

In "The Return of Peter Grimm" the complication grows out of the fact that Peter in his lifetime, as a result of his basic emotion, had laid plans which went awry and after his death he had to return in spirit to re-arrange and re-make the plans which he had made

in his lifetime. The complication in the play is the grinding between Peter Grimm, personifying planning, Frederik, his nephew, personifying deception, and Catherine and James Hartman, personifying love. Frederik, the nephew, had deceived his uncle and it was the realization of this deception that necessitated the re-arrangement of Peter Grimm's plans.

In "Romance" the complication is that of the young clergyman Armstrong, personifying the basic emotion, romance, becoming involved with the opera singer Mme. Cavallini, personifying sacrifice, and the discovery that Cavallini had been intimate with Van Tuyl, who personifies friendship.

In "The Unchastened Woman" the complication grows out of Caroline's vanity, which induced her to assume that she could seduce Lawrence Sanbury, this complication involving Emily and Krellin, Emily having been implicated with Hubert Knollys, who personifies unfaithfulness.

In "All God's Chillun Got Wings" the complication grows out of race hatred.

In "The Three Daughters of Monsieur Dupont" the complication grows out of the three daughters, Caroline, Julie and Angele, each personifying longing for companionship and marriage, and each daughter in turn dramaturgically expressing the crucible of marriage for womankind.

In "Damaged Goods" the complication grows out of the inheritance of disease.

In "Maternity" the complication grows out of injustice, involving Annette's trust, resulting in indiscretion, and Lucy's trouble, growing out of her husband's desire for drink. This play "Maternity" is a pointed illustration of poor craftsmanship, the first version being more disjointed than the second; the second, however, being badly motivated, the basic emotion being injustice, personified by Lucy, Madeline, Annette and Catherine, their respective complications, however, not being directly motivated to the theme.

In "The Pigeon" the complication is the direct result of charity, personified in Christopher Wellwyn bestowing his charity upon an undeserved vagabond, wanton and gambler.

In "Richelieu" the complication arises out of the packet containing the plans of conspiracy, scheming the death of Richelieu, the surrender of Paris, the dethronement of the King—the complication being the direct outcome of Richelieu's ambition, being crossed by the treachery of the Duke of Orleans, Baradas, De-Beringhen and Huguet.

In "A Doll's House" the complication is directly motivated to Nora's imprudence. The episode of her forging a note is the cause of the ensuing complication involving Krogstad's desperation and Helmer's integrity.

In "Ghosts" the complication grows out of the result of disease, being the inheritance of Oswald.

In "Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil" the com-

plication consists in the obligation undertaken by the boy, his resisting gold and protecting the Queen.

In "Spreading the News" the complication consists in Fallon becoming the victim of gossip.

In "Hyacinth Halvey" the complication is whether Halvey is saint or sinner.

In "The Rising of the Moon" the complication is between the hunter and the hunted.

In "The Jackdaw" the complication grows out of Nestor, personifying advising, which causes him to become a target.

In "The Travelling Man" the complication is the difficulty in recognizing the presence of love.

In "The Gaol Gate" the complication grows out of the dread of neighbors' gossip.

In "The Servant in the House" the complication grows out of the separation of the child from the father and the battle between truth and hypocrisy.

In "Suppressed Desires" the complication arises when Stephen, personifying remonstrance, visits the doctor.

In "Aria da Capo" the complication is in respect as to whether the game should be played on Tuesday or Wednesday.

In "Cocaine" the complication is starvation.

In "Night" the complication pivots around death.

In "Enemies" the complication grows out of the combat between idealism and prosaicism.

In "The Angel Intrudes" the complication grows

out of the fact that Annabelle, who personifies fickleness, loves the Angel.

In "Bound East for Cardiff" the complication grows out of the sea—no doctor.

In "The Widow's Veil" the complication grows out of the doubt.

In "The String of the Samisen" the complication grows out of intrigue.

In "Not Smart" the complication arises when Mattie, the maid, becomes enceinte.

In "The League of Youth" the complication arises when Stensgard, the egotist, over-sells himself.

In "Rosmersholm" the complication arises when Rosmer, personifying honor, succumbs to the unscrupulous woman.

In "The Antigone" of Sophocles the complication arises when Creon refuses to permit the burial of Polyneices.

In "Hedda Gabler" the complication arises out of Hedda Gabler's selfish desires.

In "The Master Builder" the complication arises when Solness, the master builder, personifying fear, climbs the tower.

In "Pillars of Society" the complication arises when Johan Tonnesen, personifying sacrifice, is involved with Bernick's deception.

In "The Thunderbolt" the complication arises when Phyllis Mortimore destroys the will.

In "The Fugitive" the complication arises when

Clare, by virtue of a loveless marriage, leaves her husband and finds sanctuary with Malise, and when Malise becomes helpless through giving sanctuary to Clare.

In "Justice" the complication arises when Falder, through his madness, becomes involved with the helpless woman, the forgery, the jail, the world.

In "The Mob" the complication arises when Stephen More, personifying courage, finds his idealism in conflict with his country, his relatives and his friends.

In "The Trimplet" the complication grows out of the missing sense.

In "Nevertheless" the complication arises when the burglar enters.

In "The Medicine Show" the complication arises when it appears that the basic character is too lazy to live.

In "The Clod" the complication arises through the entrance of the Northerners.

In "Eugenically Speaking" the complication arises when Una, selecting a husband, shows him to dad.

In "Overtones" the complication arises when Hetty and Maggie are involved with themselves through deceit.

In "Helena's Husband" the complication arises when the King wishes his wife to elope.

In "The Judge" the complication arises when the old man pursues Ivan.

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" there is tense complication when Mrs. Erlynne comes to London, insists on

coming to the party, goes to Lord Darlington's home, meets Lady Windemere in Lord Darlington's home, and when Lady Windemere leaves her fan in Lord Darlington's home.

In "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" the complication arises when Ellean comes home, when she goes to Paris, and when she returns with Capt. Ardale.

In "Michael and His Lost Angel" the complication arises when Michael forces Rose to penance, when Audrie meets Michael, and when they love, sin and sorrow.

In "Strife" the complication arises in the strike and when Annie Roberts dies.

In "The Madras House" the complication is poorly motivated; it arises when Philip Madras, a moral man, is engaged in solving the conflict arising in the three actions, none of which involve him, save a slight difference with Jessica, his wife.

In "The Hour-Glass" the complication arises when the angel visits the wise man.

In "Riders to the Sea" the complication arises in respect to Michael's clothes and Bartley's horses.

In "The Truth" the complication arises when Becky lies and lies and lies.

In "The Great Divide" the complication arises when Ruth Jordan is left alone; when she is carried away by the cave man; when she is discovered by her family; when she leaves for the East, and when Stephen Ghent follows her.

In "The Witching Hour" the complication arises

when Jack Brookfield's prospective nephew, Clay Whipple, kills Tom Denning; when Clay is prosecuted by Hardmuth unjustly on account of Hardmuth's revenge; when Brookfield, favoring Clay's marriage to Viola, goads Hardmuth and taunts him for his lack of honor; when Clay is convicted; when the love of Brookfield for Clay's mother is disclosed; when Brookfield fights for Clay; when the scene shifts to Washington to Justice Prentice's abode; when the new trial takes place; when Brookfield charges Hardmuth with the murder of the Kentucky governor.

In "The Scarecrow" the complication arises when Ravensbane, the causative character, is created by Goody Rickby and Dickon; when Ravensbane wooes Rachel; when illusion is attacked.

In "The Weavers" the complication involves the manufacturer's risk and the employees' hardships.

In "The Vale of Content" the complication arises when Elizabeth flees from von Roecknitz; when Elizabeth marries Wiedemann; when she longs in "the vale of content"; when von Roecknitz visits the "vale of content"; when Elizabeth and von Roecknitz are in emotional combat.

In "The Red Robe" the complication arises when the basic character, Mouzon, (torture) pursues an innocent victim.

In "Know Thyself" the complication arises when it appears that Clarisse de Siberan is in love with Pavail, and when Pavail protects Jean.

In "Pelleas and Melisande" the complication arises out of fantastic love.

In "Beyond Human Power" the complication grows out of the doubting children, the sliding mountain, the church—yes or no.

In "The Father" the complication revolves around the child; the child's education, its place of abode and who is its father.

In "The Cherry Orchard" the complication arises when the improvident woman, Madame Ranevsky, does not heed advice.

In "Widowers' Houses" the complication arises when Sartorius (hardness) desires his daughter Blanche (temper) to marry; when hardness is uncovered to the hypocrite Trench; when hardness is uncovered to his daughter Blanche.

In "The Philanderer" the complication arises between Leonard Charteris (the philanderer), Julia Craven (the jealous woman) and Grace Tranfield (poise).

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession" the complication arises when the daughter, Vivie, the basic character (morality) suspects her mother, and when her mother (immorality) confesses to Vivie.

In "Arms and the Man" the complication arises when Bluntschli finds sanctuary in Raina's apartment; when Saranoff hugs Louka, and in connection with the coat, the photograph and the carpet bag.

In "Candida" the complication arises when it ap-

pears that the poet loves Candida; when Candida mothers the poet, and when integrity rebels.

MOTIVATION THROUGH CRISIS

What is crisis? Ultimate crisis is the apex or supreme emotional point in the play; it is the explosion—the thing that comes out of the crucible as a result of the complication and/or intrigue that grows out of the conflicting elements which are put in the crucible. After the elements of conflict which have been placed in the dramatic crucible have gone through processes of gestation, incubation, fermentation, travail, battle and struggle, there comes the crisis; it is the tensest moment in the play. Mr. Archer says ("Play-Making," page 36): "What, then, is the essence of drama, if conflict be not it? What is the common quality of themes, scenes, and incidents, which we recognize as specifically dramatic? Perhaps we shall scarcely come nearer to a helpful definition than if we say that the essence of drama is *crisis*. A play is a more or less rapidly-developing crisis in destiny or circumstance, and a dramatic scene is a crisis within a crisis, clearly furthering the ultimate event. The drama may be called the art of crises . . ."

At page 137 he says: ". . . it is the business of the dramatist to analyze the crises with which he deals, and to present them to us in their rhythm of growth, culmination, solution."

At page 138 he says: ". . . a play consists, or ought to consist, of a great crisis, worked out through series of minor crises. An act, then, ought to consist either of a minor crisis, carried to its temporary solution, or of a well-marked group of such crises; and there can be no rule as to the number of such crises which ought to present themselves in the development of a given theme."

At page 321 he says: "We have agreed to regard a play as essentially a crisis in the lives of one or more persons; and we all know that crises are much more apt to have a definite beginning than a definite end. We can almost always put our finger upon the moment—not, indeed, when the crisis began—but when we clearly realized its presence or its imminence."

Crisis is the basic emotion in victory or defeat as a direct or sequential result of combat with another emotion, or a combination of emotions constituting secondary characters or inanimate things. There may be, and often is, a series of crises. It is the ultimate culminating crisis that constitutes the supreme opportunity for the craftsman's inventive genius. The crisis will, in the very nature of things, take such form as the preceding elements demand and require. The law of the play is cause and effect—the causative chain of sequential events. Crisis must be motivated inductively through complication and/or intrigue, conflict and crucible, through the personification of and to the basic emotion.

MOTIVATION THROUGH CRISIS

What do playwrights and critics mean when they speak of crisis? Many authorities on playwriting, as well as playwrights themselves, treat crisis as synonymous with conflict. This is confusing and erroneous. Crisis is a separate, distinct and independent element in a play, entirely apart from conflict or complication and/or intrigue. Crisis is the thing which the complication and/or intrigue creates or produces; it is the result of the grinding, battle or struggle of the things animate or inanimate constituting the conflict. In "Othello," among other elements of conflict, there is placed in the crucible with Othello, Iago and Desdemona. Iago fed the consuming fire of Othello's jealousy. The things that Iago did to Othello created the complication and intrigue; this complication and intrigue of Iago produced and created the dramatic crisis in which Othello, as a result of his metaphysical and psychological antecedent, his basic emotion being jealousy, convinced that Desdemona was unfaithful and disloyal, strangled Desdemona.

Crisis is an element essential in every logical and well made play. The crisis need not necessarily be physical. In many plays of the very highest order it is mental. It may be metaphysical and psychological. It may be objective or subjective, but it must be the supreme moment in the play. Climax is often used confusedly when crisis is meant or intended. Crisis is the thing which creates in the mind of the auditor the psychic echo—the mental or metaphysical activity—

the tuning fork, as it were, which enables the auditor to react to the basic emotion. The crisis should be motivated to the basic emotion. The crisis should be a crisis in the life of the character personifying the basic emotion. Crisis is the emotional compelling thing, thrilling, interesting, holding and entertaining the audience. It is the supreme moment when the mountain climber has reached the top and visions the snow-clad hills beyond. Crisis should be traceable inductively through the preceding constituent elements.

It is while the complication and/or intrigue are carrying on that the dramatic suspense and interest is enlisted, aroused and held as the play progresses from crises to crises and to ultimate crisis. Henry Arthur Jones, cited in Mr. Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," pages 467–468, quoting Mr. Archer, says: " 'A play is a more or less rapidly developing crisis in destiny or circumstance; and a dramatic scene is a crisis within a crisis, clearly furthering the ultimate event.' "

The play sustains interest by the invention of delayed and delaying barriers, emotional contacts, verbal or physical processes causing fear or pity—the basic causative character in emotional combat with nature, with animate or inanimate things.

If the play does not produce a dramatic crisis, if the elements which have been fed into the crucible and which constitute the conflict do not become sufficiently aggressive and combative to create complication and/or

intrigue in so tense a degree as to produce a crisis, the play is very likely to be without dramatic value. We have found no real drama without a distinct crisis. In the very nature of things, when the audience has, by exposition, been led to understand the basic theme and the basic personification or characterization of the theme, and is led into the mystery of the crucible in which the playwright intends to fuse his play, when the audience has come to understand and appreciate the characters and elements which have been placed in the crucible constituting the conflict, and to know and understand the development of the complication and/or intrigue—the surge of the play—and is aroused by the characters and elements placed in the crucible, and is, by logical processes of cause and effect, made to understand and is thrilled by the crisis created, it becomes ready and anxious to know the result or outcome —the climax.

Before undertaking to deal with the subject of climax, we think it of value to submit illustrative examples of crisis as contained in recognized plays:

What is the crisis in "A New Way to Pay Old Debts"? The crisis is when Sir Giles Overreach ascertains that his game is up; that he has hoist himself by his own petard; that he can no longer retain the property which he has, by intrigue, stolen from his nephew Wellborn; that, notwithstanding all his intrigue, he cannot secure Lady Allworth's property, and, above everything else, he cannot marry his daughter

Margaret to Lord Lovell. When Sir Giles Overreach has ascertained that his daughter, notwithstanding his machinations, has married Tom Allworth, it is the moment of supreme crisis. Sir Giles' coadjutor (Marrall), whose basic emotion is deceit, says:

> Yes, and uncase you too.
> "The idiot, the patch, the slave, the booby,
> The property fit only to be beaten
> For your morning exercise," your "football," or
> "The unprofitable lump of flesh," your "drudge,"
> Can now anatomize you, and lay open
> All your black plots, and level with the earth
> Your hill of pride, and, with these gabions guarded,
> Unload my great artillery, and shake,
> Nay pulverize, the walls you think defend you.

Sir Giles says:

> O that I had thee in my gripe, I would tear thee Joint after joint.

The crisis in "Countess Julia" comes when she realizes her helplessness. She says:

> I cannot go, I cannot stay; O, help me! I am so tired, so boundlessly tired. Command me! Put new life into me, for I can neither think nor act.

Julia goes upstairs, at the behest of Jean, and presently returns in a traveling costume and with a small bird cage covered with a towel; she places it on a chair and says:

> Well, I am ready.

Jean describes her looks. She is pale like a corpse. Her face is dirty. He says:

> . . . Are we to drag bird cages along also? Have you lost your senses?
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Well, give the little beast here, then; I will twist its neck.

Julia takes the bird out of the cage and kisses it. She says:

> O, my little darling pet, that your own mistress should sentence you to death!

Jean says:

> Now, have the goodness, please, no scenes! Your entire life and happiness are at stake. So quickly! [*He tears the bird out of her hand and carries it over to the kitchen block and takes a kitchen knife.*]

Julia [*screams*]:

> O, kill me too! Kill me! If you can kill an innocent creature without having your hand tremble! Oh! I hate and abhor you. There is blood between us. I curse the hour when I first saw you, I curse the hour when I was born.

This is motivation of the extreme crisis as a result of Countess Julia's passion. She has seduced her man-servant and his return is to kill before her the little bird—her pet. She realizes that the penalty which her passion has brought her is hopelessness of any possible comradeship with Jean.

In "Magda" the crisis comes when Schwartze, addressing Magda, says:

> It's in God's hand. But I implore you— Come here my child—nearer—so—I implore you— Let me be happy in my dying hour. Tell me that you have remained pure in body and soul and then go with my blessing on your way.

Shortly thereafter Schwartze, addressing vonKeller, says:

> Councillor von Keller, I know you to be as discreet as you are sensible; but there are cases in which silence is a crime. I ask you—and your life-long relations with me give me the right to ask, as well as the mystery —which just now— In short, I ask you. Do you know anything discreditable about my daughter's life there?

Schwartze comes to realize that Magda has followed a free life.

In "Mrs. Dane's Defence" the crisis comes when Sir Daniel says to Mrs. Dane:

> I say you're lying! You are Felicia Hindemarsh! [*He looks at her steadily. Her eyes drop. She sinks on her knees before him, seizes his hand in supplication, looks at him appealingly; he angrily withdraws his hand.*]

Mrs. Dane says:

> Don't tell Lionel!

Sir Daniel says [*with a little laugh*]:

Not tell Lionel?

Mrs. Dane [*dry, quiet voice*]:

I'm not a bad woman. You don't know. You wouldn't condemn me if you knew all.

Sir Daniel says:

Tell me.

She then proceeds to tell him her life; that she had had a child; that it was living with an old servant of hers; she begs Sir Daniel to protect and cover her. He refuses. This is the apex of the play—the supreme emotional moment.

In "Hindle Wakes" the crisis is when Nathaniel Jeffcote makes plain to Sir Timothy that if Alan does not marry Fanny he (Nathaniel Jeffcote) will not leave his brass (fortune) to Alan; that he intends, as personified in his basic emotion (integrity), to see that his boy does the square thing by Fanny.

In the play "Hindle Wakes" there is a subsidiary crisis after the apex of the play, that is, when Beatrice Farrar tells Alan that she will not marry him. She says:

I care nothing for my father or yours. I care a good deal for what has happened, but it shows, I think, that you need me even more than I need you. For I do need you, Alan. So much that nothing on earth could

make me break off our engagement, if I felt that it was at all possible to let it go on. But it isn't. It's impossible.

Alan says:

Impossible? Why do you say that? Of course it's not impossible.

Beatrice:

Yes, it is. Because to all intents and purposes you are already married.

Alan:

No, Bee!

Beatrice:

You say I'm old fashioned. Old-fashioned people used to think that when a man treated a girl as you have treated Fanny it was his duty to marry her.

Beatrice Farrar personifies the same basic emotion as does Nathaniel Jeffcote, that is, integrity. She loves Alan sentimentally, but conceives, as a matter of integrity, that he is already married to Fanny. If, as a matter of fact, this play had been built up scientifically, the supreme crisis would not have been developed in the play before this subsidiary crisis.

Notwithstanding the success of this play "Hindle Wakes," and the various encomiums which have been pronounced upon it, it is unscientific and unsatisfactory in its development—particularly in the cli-

max, which will be referred to in a succeeding chapter.

In "A False Saint" the supreme crisis is when Julie learns through Christine that Henri loved her and had expressed his love before his death. In Act III. Christine says:

> If there were any harm in telling what I know, I should have been told to be silent. But I was left perfectly free. Seeing how things are now, I'm sorry I've not spoken sooner. Near the end of his sickness, when we were told there was no hope of his living, one morning I was watching alone by Papa's bedside; I leaned over the bed, he caught me in his arms and held me with all his strength and said to me: "Christine, I want you to do something for me—don't forget; you know that a cousin of yours, Julie Renaudin, is a nun at Sacre Coeur de Vannes—she has suffered because of me, and I profoundly regret it. On my deathbed I think often of her. If ever you think she will be consoled by knowing this, tell her. But make sure first, otherwise it would serve only to summon up painful memories which she has probably not been troubled with. In any event, I want you to make a special effort to be friends with her. This is a sort of reparation for me—be a daughter to her. I hardly think you will see her before you marry, but afterward, make an effort to do so and be kind to her. I count on you, dear child." Then he pressed me again with a kind of fierce rage, as if he wanted to transfer what was dying in his heart to my own.
>
> [*Julie listens to all this with breathless anxiety, her eyes staring, fists clenched. As* CHRISTINE *ends, she falls to her knees and buries her face in her hands, her*

whole body convulsed with sobs. CHRISTINE *tries to raise her.*]

Julie, why, what's this? You're all—! Look at me; shouldn't I have told you?

Julie [*still on her knees, her head bowed, hands joined and held humbly*) *to Christine*]:

Yes, yes, a thousand times, yes! If you had only spoken before! Then I shouldn't have had to fall at your feet, at your mother's, to raise my arms up to Henri, and ask forgiveness of you three, forgiveness for my hateful hypocrisy. How detestable I am! Yet—give me one word of pity. Christine, tell me again: your father did not die hating me?

Christine [*surprised and a little frightened, steps back while Julie supplicates her*] says:

Oh, Julie, I told you exactly what occurred at his last conversation with me. After that he was so weak he could hardly smile at us. He hate you? How horrible! Then what did you think of that letter I wrote you? You said you were touched by it? I wrote that straight from the heart, that was my way of doing what he asked me—the first chance I had. That was before he was buried.

In "The Magistrate" the supreme crisis, the apex of the play, is when the Magistrate (Posket) ascertains that his wife is the prisoner at the bar whom he has sentenced upon a plea of guilty to seven days without the option of a fine.

In "The Mollusc" the crisis comes when Mrs. Bax-

ter learns through her brother Tom that she is about to lose her husband through her mollusc disposition—permitting her husband and Miss Roberts to be together continuously.

In "Abie's Irish Rose" the crisis comes when Solomon learns that Abie's Rose is Irish, and when Patrick Murphy learns that Rose Mary has married a Jewish boy.

In "As a Man Thinks" the crisis comes when DeLota's and Eleanor's relations are uncovered.

In "The Return of Peter Grimm" the crisis comes when Frederik is exposed.

In "Romance" the crisis comes when Thomas Armstrong, the Bishop, personifying romance, is redeemed by Mme. Cavallini.

In "The Unchastened Woman" the crisis comes when Caroline Knollys is forced to retract and is humiliated.

In "Spreading the News" the crisis comes when Fallon is falsely arrested for murder, as a result of gossip.

In "Hyacinth Halvey" the crisis comes when a wicked man struggles against a good name created by testimonial.

In "The Rising of the Moon" the crisis comes upon the turn of the wheel, X and B come back to the dock, and the hunted man admits his identity.

In "The Jackdaw" the crisis comes when Cooney, personifying distrust, and Mrs. Broderick, personifying distraction, turn on Joseph Nestor, personifying advising.

In "The Workhouse Ward" the crisis arises when McInerney refuses to go to the home of his sister unless she takes Michael Miskell with them, and she refuses.

In "The Travelling Man" the crisis comes when the Messiah comes and is unrecognized.

In "The Gaol Gate" the crisis comes when it appears that there is no informer.

In "The Trimplet" the crisis comes when the chemistry of hate is disclosed in opposition to love.

In "Nevertheless" it is doubtful if there is any crisis. This is also true of "The Medicine Show."

In "Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil" the crisis comes when the headsman arrives and the Queen is found, the boy and the butterfly detaining the headsman until the clock strikes.

In "All God's Chillun Got Wings" the crisis comes when Ella's hatred of the negro is revealed and the realization of her own degradation.

In "A Doll's House" the crisis comes when Nora's illusion that her husband is a god is dispelled and she realizes that there is no miracle.

In "Ghosts" the crisis comes when Oswald discloses that he is destined to have softening of the brain—paresis.

In "The Wild Duck" the crisis comes when Hialmar learns of Gina's deceit and Hedvig's doubtful paternity—the supreme crisis when Hedvig realizes that she is a "wild duck."

In "Richelieu" the crisis comes when it appears that the conspiracy has failed and that Richelieu still lives.

In "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the crisis comes when Wellborn, Marrall and Lovell uncover the intrigue of Sir Giles Overreach.

In "Suppressed Desires" the crisis comes when Stephen tells his wife.

In "Aria da Capo" it is doubtful if there is a crisis, but if there is one, it would seem to be "nothing matters if one loves."

In "Cocaine" the crisis is death by gas.

In "Night" the crisis is despair.

In "Enemies" the crisis is the possible separation.

In "The Angel Intrudes" the crisis is when Annabelle leaves with the Angel.

In "Bound East for Cardiff" the crisis is when Yank is dying.

In "The Widow's Veil" the crisis is when he does not die.

In "The String of the Samisen" the crisis is when Aninori stabs Tama.

In "Not Smart" the crisis comes when Milo, the husband, is charged with being responsible for Mattie's pregnancy.

In "The Clod" the crisis arises when Mary Trask is being cursed and, in desperation, shoots.

In "Eugenically Speaking" the crisis comes when it develops that he is married.

In "Overtones" there does not seem to be a crisis.

In "Helena's Husband" the crisis arises when Paris comes.

In "The Thunderbolt" the crisis arises when Phyllis confesses.

In "The Master Builder" the crisis arises when Solness falls from the tower.

In "The Pillars of Society" the crisis arises when the ship *Indian Girl* does not sail.

In "Hedda Gabler" the crisis arises when Judge Brack tyrannizes Hedda.

In "The League of Youth" the crisis arises when Stensgard, the egotistical lawyer, meets with rebuffs everywhere.

In "Rosmersholm" the crisis arises when honor dares unscrupulousness.

In "A False Saint" the crisis arises when Julie learns through Christine that Henri loved her and so expressed himself before his death.

In "The Mob" the crisis arises when the mob confronts Stephen More.

In "Justice" the crisis arises when the woman, Ruth Honeywill, personifying helplessness, again confronts Falder in the office of James How.

In "The Fugitive" the crisis arises when Clare, through desperation, leaves Malise.

In "Magda" the crisis arises when Schwartze discovers that Magda has a child and has been philandering.

In "Polly with a Past" the crisis arises when Rex

discovers that he loves Polly and does not love Myrtle.

In "The Fool" the crisis arises when Joe Hennig and the mob attack Gilchrist and he is saved by Mary Margaret.

In "The Servant in the House" the crisis arises when the Vicar discovers truth.

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the supreme crisis is when Lady Windemere is about to be exposed in Lord Darlington's apartment through her fan.

In "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" the supreme crisis comes when Paula's relation to Ardale is developed.

In "Michael and His Lost Angel" the supreme crisis comes when Michael confesses and does penance.

In "Strife" the supreme crisis arises when the basic character, personifying hardness, is out-voted.

In "The Madras House" the supreme crisis comes when it is suggested that the basic character's father was the cause of Miss Yates' condition.

In "The Hour-Glass" the crisis comes when the sand in the hour-glass runs down.

In "Riders to the Sea" the crisis comes when Bartley's body is brought home.

In "The Truth" the crisis comes when Tom leaves Becky.

In "The Great Divide" the crisis arises when Ruth is stricken mentally ill.

In "The Witching Hour" the crisis arises when Hardmuth is about to kill Jack Brookfield.

In "The Scarecrow" the crisis arises when Ravensbane, the illusion, is dispelled.

In "The Weavers" the crisis comes when the rioting mob burns the manufacturer's factory.

In "The Vale of Content" the crisis comes when Elizabeth confesses to Wiedemann.

In "The Red Robe" the crisis comes when Mouzon (torture) is about to convict Etchepare (innocence).

In "Know Thyself" the crisis comes when Clarisse de Siberan confesses.

In "Pelleas and Melisande" the crisis arises when Golaud kills Pelleas.

In "Beyond Human Power" when the pastor's wife walks.

In "The Father" when Laura, the wife (tyranny) declares that the child is not the daughter of the cavalry captain.

In "The Cherry Orchard" the crisis arises when improvidence (Madame Ranevsky) loses her home.

In "The Judge" when the old man threatens to expose Ivan.

In "Widower's Houses" when temper (Blanche) dismisses hypocrisy (Trench).

In "The Philanderer" the tensest crisis in the play is in the first act, when Julia, the jealous woman, discloses to Grace Transfield her relations to the "philanderer." The balance of the play is largely a descending drama.

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession" the crisis comes

when Vivie, the basic character (morality) learns that her mother did not tell her the whole story.

In "Arms and the Man" the crisis arises when Louka wins Saranoff.

In "Candida" the crisis arises when Candida must choose between Morall and Marchbanks.

It must be understood that in the foregoing statement of ultimate crisis it is not intended to indicate that in each and every play the crisis is logically or scientifically motivated. In many plays the crisis is the result of a secondary action, and in many instances the ultimate crisis does not directly involve the basic character; for example,—in "The Madras House" the basic character was only indirectly concerned in the crisis; his personal life was not involved. In truth, "The Madras House" is not a play in a scientific sense of the word. The play lacks unity, contains a mass of irrelevant matter, is difficult to read or understand.

MOTIVATION THROUGH CLIMAX

From the foregoing analysis the reader should now thoroughly understand the end, place and purpose of climax in a play. It has been often stated that a play must have a "happy ending" in order to be financially successful. If this were true, it would be a sad commentary upon the mentality of American playgoers. We are not willing to subscribe to such a general condemnation of the intelligence of the American

public. We do not believe it essential that, in order to have a successful play, there must be a "happy ending." The essential thing is that the climax, that is, the dénouement—the thing that is done with, or happens to the causative character in the play, or that the causative character does to someone else, shall satisfy the emotional reaction of the audience. The fundamental and logical question always comes to this—Does the causative character deserve victory or defeat? The victory may be death. The defeat may be life. In "The Wild Duck" Hedvig, the causative character, at the end of the play kills herself with a pistol. This is not, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, "a happy ending." The girl Hedvig is the causative character in the play; she is innocence; she learns that she is the "wild duck"; nevertheless, to that great philosophical audience which appreciates Ibsen, and which is more or less in tune or communion with Ibsen's understanding of life (Bernard Shaw excepted), the death of Hedvig was a victory. This beautiful innocent child, with subsidiary emotions entirely in unison with her basic emotion, is the victim of a corrupt man (Werle, Sr.) and Gina, her mother, personifying deception. As a result of this deception a narrow man, personifying integrity, with subsidiary emotions of justice, vanity and sensitiveness, marries Gina. We have read many encomiums on the character of Gina, none of which would seem to be justified, if the character is understood. Whatever may have been the extenuating cir-

cumstances, Gina is deception. For fourteen years Gina has lived with Hialmar and deceived him as to the father of her child. For fourteen years her life has been a living lie. The writer is unable to find in this character anything deserving the encomiums that have been written. The marriage between Gina and Hialmar was an impossible marriage whenever Gina's deception was exposed. The innocent child is ground between the three emotional contacts. What possible outlook did life hold for this little girl? Her fateful destiny was being stressed and emphasized by Gregers Werle—a man of honor, with fanatic idealism urging sacrifice. The child could find surcease from sorrow only in death. From the standpoint of logic, and to a mind of understanding, familiar with the surge and current of realistic life—tragic and imponderable—death was a logical ending and to the basic character "a happy ending."

In all reasonable and probable plays an audience will accept any ending which is a logical result of a causative character moving through a sequential chain of events or episodes, even though the play may not have the conventional "happy ending." It is not essential in a successful play that the basic or causative character win. Audiences, as a rule, have fine sporting proclivities; invariably they justify the deserving winner. In practically all plays the causative character is in conflict with antagonistic emotions. As a rule, the play involves morality, ethics, justice, equity.

Public sympathy invariably runs with the rightful character. This postulate may be reckoned with and may be established in the Algebraic Formula when, by processes of inductive and deductive reasoning, the five C's are correlated from the basic emotion to the climax. If the basic emotion is an unethical, immoral or dishonest one, the audience will not countenance the winning of the battle by such a causative character, unless the causative character has some exceptional saving grace which causes him to become endeared to the audience.

It is not necessary for the hero or heroine to win. In "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the causative character lost. In "Magda" the causative character (Schwartze, personifying tyranny) loses. At the end of the play he dies. It is not a "happy ending"; nevertheless it is recognized as a strong play. The play does not solve the problem as to what became of Magda, because, as a matter of fact, it is not Magda's play; it is Schwartze's play—Schwartze, the tyrannical father, caused his daughter Magda to abandon her home and seek a life that led her far astray. In "Othello" the climax of the play is the death of Desdemona. This is not a "happy ending," yet it is one of Shakespeare's greatest plays. The thread of jealousy, the dominant and basic emotion, runs entirely through the play, and the climax, the dénouement, or the causative sequence of this jealousy, is the strangling to death of Desdemona by Othello. Everything that

Othello *is* in the play, everything that he *says* and *does*, characterizes his jealousy. Everything that Iago, the main secondary character in the play, *is*, everything that he *does* or *says*, fans the jealousy of Othello. Everything that Desdemona *is*, all that she *says* and *does*, constituting her one of the elements of conflict in the play, makes her inevitably the victim of Othello's jealousy. Desdemona is the subject of heart-interest. The audience cannot fail to have great sympathy for her, intense reactive emotion for her unfortunate predicament, yet she dies and the play ends unhappily.

It is the privilege of the craftsman to decide the climax. If the decision is an arbitrary one, even though it result in a "happy ending," the play is illogical. The climax must be the inevitable result of the inexorable law which follows from cause to effect. Every step of the way the craftsman must have in mind motivation inductively through the five C's to the basic emotion.

We shall now undertake to demonstrate that climax, from the standpoint of logic and organic structure, in a well-made play is inevitable. If the climax does not logically demonstrate the major premise involved in the basic emotion constituting the dramatic theme as dramaturgically developed and expressed, the play does not run to form. Many plays wobble at the end. In the play "The Fool," by Channing Pollock, it will be remembered that the basic theme is sacrifice. All through the play Daniel Gilchrist, the causative charac-

ter, sacrifices, paralleling in human character the story of the Christ. The supreme question as to whether or not sacrifice pays or brings any reward has never been definitely decided in the history of the world, and Mr. Pollock did not solve this question in his play "The Fool." In the very beginning of his play Mrs. Gilliam says:

> . . . Where's the Star of Bethlehem?

Dilly says:

> It doesn't work, Mother.

The star of Bethlehem symbolizes sacrifice. At the end of the play Mary Margaret, standing with Daniel Gilchrist at the window, says:

> Mr. Gilchrist! Is that the Star of Bethlehem?

Daniel says:

> I wonder.

Sacrifice led the causative character to personal peace. The play does not undertake to solve the problems it propounds. From a logical standpoint, the causative character (sacrifice) at the end of the play should not have wondered; he should have known. The play legitimately leaves hanging in the balance the question as to whether or not the character was in reality "*a Fool.*" This should not exist in the play. The play should have demonstrated and should demonstrate that the causative character was not a fool.

In the play "A False Saint" the basic and primary theme is the emotional penance, and at the end of the play Julie, the basic character, personifying penance, returns to the convent. The climax is logical, succinct and true to form.

In the play "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the basic character, Sir Giles Overreach, personifying the basic emotion intrigue, at the climax of the play goes mad and dies. This is logical and just.

In "Magda" Schwartze, the basic character, personifying tyranny, at the climax dies.

In "Mrs. Dane's Defence" Mrs. Dane, personifying deception, at the close of the play—the climax—is uncovered; she loses her fight and is unable to marry young Carteret.

In the play "Hindle Wakes" the climax is unscientific and unsatisfactory. At the end of the play Fanny refuses to marry Alan Jeffcote. The inference of the play is that Beatrice will marry him. It is an arbitrary ending. If the play ended logically, the last speech would have been that of Nathaniel Jeffcote to Alan, in substance:

> Alan, my boy, Fanny, who week-ended with you, refuses to marry you because she says when she marries she must marry a real man; Beatrice has refused to marry you because as a matter of integrity she thinks you belong to Fanny. Fanny is a willy-nilly girl. Beatrice is a correct girl. Both of them think you unworthy. Therefore, my son, go out into the world and

> when you have proven yourself a man, come home and I will give you my fortune.

That would have been a worth-while ending.

In "The Mollusc" the climax is when Mrs. Baxter wakes up and ascertains that her life of being a mollusc, if persisted in, would lose her husband. Mrs. Baxter says, addressing her husband:

> I want you to rely on me, dear, so that when you're in trouble, you'll turn to me. What can I do for your poor foot? . . .

Again Mrs. Baxter says:

> Don't trouble, Miss Roberts, I will go myself directly. [*Then to* MR. BAXTER] You know, dear, we must learn to do without Miss Roberts.

In other words, Mrs. Baxter ceases being a mollusc and regains her husband.

In "The Magistrate" the climax discloses the deception of Mrs. Posket, her boy and Mr. Posket. There comes confession and reconciliation.

In "Abie's Irish Rose" the climax comes when the power of love overcomes the racial prejudice.

In "A Doll's House" the climax comes when Nora slams the door; imprudence leaves integrity.

In "Ghosts" the climax comes when the basic character, Oswald, at the end of the play is the victim of paresis, his dread.

In "Richelieu" the climax comes when Richelieu wins and lives for France—ambition triumphs.

In "As a Man Thinks" the climax comes when Frank Clayton forgives his wife and he takes her back. It is to be noted that Frank Clayton is not the causative character, and forgiveness, the dominant emotion of the causative character, becomes merely an influence upon the life of others.

In "The Return of Peter Grimm" the climax comes when Catherine and James marry, the result of Grimm's spiritual planning.

In "The Unchastened Woman" the climax comes when Hildegarde pardons Lawrence Sanbury.

In "Romance" the climax comes when Thomas marries VanTuyl's niece.

In "The Trimplet" the climax comes when Lady Caratina marries Milton-Maurice.

In "Nevertheless" the climax comes when the boy and the girl walk.

In "The Medicine Show" the climax comes when it appears that Luter is satisfied merely to exist.

In "Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil" the climax comes when the Queen is saved.

In "Spreading the News" the climax comes when Bartley Fallon is released.

In "Hyacinth Halvey" the climax comes when it appears that Hyacinth cannot avoid his testimonials and good reputation.

In "The Rising of the Moon" the climax comes when the Sergeant, the causative character (consideration) helps the lawless, considering that he might have been lawless instead of lawful.

In "The Jackdaw" the climax comes when he asks to be covered with tidbits.

In "The Workhouse Ward" the climax comes when Mike McInerney and Michael Miskell stay in the workhouse ward and resume their quarrelling.

In "The Travelling Man" the climax comes when the Messiah is driven out by the woman he saved—love unrecognized.

In "The Gaol Gate" the climax comes when the praises of Denis are sung.

In "Countess Julia" the climax comes when the Countess commits suicide as a direct result of her basic emotion (passion).

In "The Judge" the climax comes when Ivan, the causative character, suicides through fear.

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the climax comes when Mrs. Erlynne sacrifices in order that innocence (her daughter) may be happy.

In "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" the climax comes when Paula suicides as a direct result of her jealousy.

In "Michael and His Lost Angel" the climax comes when Michael and Audrey die in Italy.

In "Strife" the climax comes when the strike ends.

In "The Madras House" the climax comes when Philip Madras (morality) and his wife (Jessica) kiss.

This climax again illustrates that "The Madras House" is not a logical play. There was in truth no issue of morality between Philip Madras and his wife. The play does not involve, except in a very minor degree, any struggle between Philip Madras and his wife. The play is not about Philip Madras and his wife. The crucible is women, or womankind, and the play is a kaleidoscope of episodes involving women.

In "The Hour-Glass" the climax comes when the wise man dies.

In "The Truth" the climax comes when Becky Warder, the lying wife, is taken home by her honorable husband, Tom Warder.

In "The Great Divide" the climax comes when Stephen Ghent (hardness) proves that Ruth's sacrifice was not in vain. In this play, "The Great Divide," the climax presents a conversion of the causative character from hardness, in connection with which it is interesting to read John Dryden's comment (Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 187). Mr. Dryden says: " 'But I find I have been too long in this discourse, since the French have many other excellencies not common to us; as that you never see any of their plays end with a conversion, or simple change of will, which is the ordinary way which our poets use to end theirs. It shows little art in the conclusion of a dramatic poem, when they who have hindered the felicity during the four acts, desist from it in the fifth, without some powerful cause to take them

off their design; and though I deny not but such reasons may be found, yet it is a path that is cautiously to be trod, and the poet is to be sure he convinces the audience that the motive is strong enough. As for example, the conversion of the Usurer in "The Scornful Lady" seems to me a little forced; for, being an usurer, which implies a lover of money to the highest degree of covetousness,—and such the poet has represented him,—the account he gives for the sudden change is, that he has been duped by the wild young fellows; which in reason might render him more wary another time, and make him punish himself with harder fare and coarser clothes, to get up again what he had lost; but that he should look on it as a judgment, and so repent, we may expect to hear in a sermon, but I should never endure it in a play.' "

In "The Witching Hour" the climax comes when Jack Brookfield takes Hardmuth across the border.

In "The Scarecrow" the climax comes when Ravensbane dies.

In "The Weavers" the climax comes when the mob drives the soldiers back.

In "The Vale of Content" the climax comes when he forgives and she remains.

In "The Red Robe" the climax comes when Mouzon, personifying torture, is killed by innocence, the wife of Etchepare, not as a result of what Mouzon had done to Etchepare, but as a result of what Mouzon had done to her.

In "Know Thyself" the climax comes when duty binds Clarisse de Siberon to her husband.

In "Pelleas and Melisande" the climax comes when Melisande dies.

In "Beyond Human Power" the climax comes when the pastor and his wife die.

In "The Father" the climax comes when the cavalry captain dies.

In "The Cherry Orchard" the climax comes when the improvident woman returns to Paris and sin.

In "Widowers' Houses" the climax comes when temper (Blanche) makes up with hypocrisy (Trench).

In "The Philanderer" the climax comes when Dr. Paramore marries Julia. This climax is an illogical and unscientific ending. It is extremely doubtful if a doctor would be as naïve as to fall for Julia.

In "Mrs. Warren's Profession" the climax comes when Mrs. Warren and her daughter (Vivie) part.

In "Arms and the Man" the climax comes when Bluntschli, the adventurer, marries Raina.

In "Candida" the climax comes when Candida chooses James.

From the foregoing it is obvious that the climax, or dénouement, should concern the causative character. It is not scientific playwriting, or within the realm of art, to have the climax relate solely to secondary or subsidiary characters. If the mosaic, that is, finely put together, does not represent a picture of the causative character, the play necessarily lacks unity of expression.

The great majority of plays contain much irrelevant matter and wander, jump and become vagrant fugitives.

We do not wish to be understood as asserting that a play may not have secondary or even tertiary actions. It is, however, dangerous playwriting, and unless the secondary or tertiary action is interwoven with the primary action in such a way as to be a necessary part of the primary action, the play becomes abortive.

CHAPTER XII

PROGRESSION BY NARRATIVE, PLOT OR STORY

PROGRESSION by narrative, plot or story is the fourth constituent element in the organic structure. Narrative, plot or story must be understood as synonymous terms. Many critics have undertaken to differentiate narrative, plot or story. This is due to a misunderstanding of what constitutes narrative, plot or story. Confusing classification and terminology in respect to narrative, plot or story is responsible for many misleading statements. Plot is invariably confused with theme. Plot and/or theme are confused with orientation. Plot and/or theme and/or orientation are confused with character. There is no identity between plot, theme, orientation or character; each has its definitive place and relation in the play. The terms should not be used interchangeably.

What is the narrative, plot or story? It is the fictional complex which takes the play from point to point, place to place, scene to scene, picture to picture, situation to situation, episode to episode. It has been described as the thread holding together the gallery of portraits. This description is not entirely accurate. The gallery of portraits constitutes the derivative situations—the compartmentation. Travelling from one

gallery of portraits to another gallery of portraits and dramaturgically explaining or interpreting the gallery of portraits and the constituent members thereof is the narrative, plot or story.✓

✓A most graphic description of narrative, plot or story is to say that it is the thing which pushes the play from hole to hole, from cause to effect in an ever-ascending scale; it is the chain of causation; it is the play travelling—the movement of the play—the action of the play.✓ Mr. Barrett H. Clark says, in his "Study of the Modern Drama," page 139: "Plot is a term open to many interpretations; story is almost synonymous."

At page 322 he says: "The best comedies, as we have seen, have plots which in the final analysis are simply the thread utilized by the dramatist to hold together his gallery of portraits."

Dryden says (Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 185): " 'Another thing in which the French differ from us and from the Spaniards, is that they do not embarrass or cumber themselves with too much plot; they only represent so much of a story as will constitute one whole and great action sufficient for a play; we, who undertake more, do but multiply adventures which, not being produced from one another, as effects from causes, but rarely following, constitute many actions in the drama, and consequently make it many plays.' "

Diderot says (Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 296): " 'A plot is an interest-

ing story, constructed according to the rules of dramatic form, which is in part the invention of the tragic poet and altogether that of the comic poet.' "

VonSchiller says ("European Theories of the Drama," page 320): " '. . . Tragedy is the imitation of a complete action. A separate event, though it be ever so tragic, does not in itself constitute a tragedy. To do this, several events are required, based one on the other, like cause and effect, and suitably connected so as to form a whole; without which the truth of the feeling represented, of the character, etc.—that is, their conformity with the nature of our mind, a conformity which alone determines our sympathy—will not be recognized. If we do not feel that we ourselves in similar circumstances should have experienced the same feelings and acted in the same way, our pity would not be awakened. It is, therefore, important that we should be able to follow in all its concatenation the action that is represented to us, that we should see it issue from the mind of the agent by a natural gradation, under the influence and with the concurrence of external circumstances.' "

Again, at page 321: " 'A series of several connected incidents is required to produce in our souls a succession of different movements which arrest the attention, which, appealing to all the faculties of our minds, enliven our instinct of activity when it is exhausted, and which, by delaying the satisfaction of this instinct, do not kindle it the less.' "

It is the writer's contention that the plot, narrative or story must tell and thread the fable of the basic or causative character whose metaphysical antecedent is in the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion.

Mr. Price, in his "The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle" is not always clear as to what constitutes the plot. At page 67, however, he does make this plain: "To master the Plot of a play so as to retain it in the mind and give it briefly is not a feat of the memory, but a natural process following out the Cause and Effect of the Action."

To enable one to do this, the primary plot must be capable of discernment and not mixed up with irrelevant matter or disintegrated through secondary or tertiary actions. Mr. Baker says ("Dramatic Technique"), page 58: "Plot, dramatically speaking, is the story so moulded by the dramatist as to gain for him in the theatre the emotional response he desires."

It is this character of platitude and generality that the Algebraic Formula supplants. Unless we are very much mistaken and misunderstand Mr. Baker's book, he does not at any time indicate of what plot consists.

In "Plots and Personalities," by Slosson and Downey, the authors have a confusing idea of plot. It is stated, at page 127: "A plot is a problem."

This is not true in any proper conception of the organic structure of a play. A plot is not a problem. All through this book of "Plots and Personalities" the

authors confuse plot with theme and orientation.

Mr. Archer ("Play-Making"), routine of composition, page 60, describes his own efforts to write a play. He says: "My difficulty was rather to find enough for my characters to say—for they never wanted to say anything that was not strictly germane to the plot."

It is doubtful if Mr. Archer has a scientific conception of plot in the organic structure of a play. Invariably Mr. Archer uses and speaks of theme when he means plot, and plot when he means theme. If the characters say that which is strictly germane to the theme (assuming that dramatic elements of conflict are placed in the crucible), the plot will naturally develop. Mr. Archer's book on "Play-Making," and indeed Mr. Baker's book "Dramatic Technique" are splendid guides and of inestimable advantage to students in respect to incidental details of technique; neither book contains a concrete analysis of the organic structure of a play. It is significant that Mr. Archer's book (the Index) contains no reference to *plot.*

Mr. Wilde's book "The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play" (the Index) contains no reference to *plot.* The "Table of Contents" contains no reference to *plot.*

Mr. Charlton Andrews ("Technique of Playwriting"), at page 37, says: "The plot is the skeleton of the play. 'The word means' explains Professor Bliss Perry, 'as its etymology implies, a weaving together.' "

At page 45 Mr. Andrews says: "The plot of a drama, then, is the indispensable story formed of inter-

woven strands of action, wherein the characters unconsciously reveal themselves."

In Prof. B. Roland Lewis' book entitled "The Technique of the One-Act Play," page 96, he cites a number of definitions of *plot.* Prof. Lewis very well says: "From a literary point of view, these definitions are interesting and in individual cases, comprehensive; but, for constructive playwriting, they are not of much value."

Thereupon, Prof. Lewis proceeds to set forth a view of plotting, and this is, in reality, in each instance *orientation.* Prof. Lewis misconceives *orientation* for *plot.*

It is the writer's view that the plot of a play is the story in action—mental and/or physical, which pushes the play forward; or, stated another way, it is the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, selected by the playwright, which basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, is personified by the central or primary character, and which is then motivated through crucible, conflict and complication to ultimate crisis and climax, and which must, in the very nature of things, develop a plot, narrative or story.

When the basic emotion is selected and personified, and the playwright elects or selects the crucible, the elements constituting the conflict, the ensuing complication and intrigue of the characters constituting conflict, motivating the basic character from the basic emotion will naturally involve a chain of causation or sequence

of events leading into crisis and climax and constituting, when woven together, the story—which is the plot.

The narrative, plot or story must be consistent and consecutive, else it will lack unity; it must not be jumpy; it must not contain irrelevant matter; it must progress upwardly and onwardly and, in the very nature of things, unfold to the audience the idea which the play is designed or intended to visualize. Each succeeding derivative situation, episode, event or incident in the play must be the effect of a preceding cause, or should consist of a hurdle or barrier created by some animate or inanimate element related directly or indirectly to the basic theme. It must push itself along and at all times accentuate or emphasize the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, upon which the play is pivoted and from which it has its genesis. Diderot says, quoted in Barrett H. Clark's "European Theories of the Drama," page 296: " 'A plot is an interesting story, constructed according to the rules of dramatic form, which is in part the invention of the tragic poet and altogether that of the comic poet.' "

CHAPTER XIII

THE PLOT OF "A DOLL'S HOUSE"

We select "A Doll's House" to illustrate and accentuate the plot as contra-distinguished from the other elements of a play for the reason that the narrative, plot or story of "A Doll's House" is practically perfect.—

The basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, constituting the theme is *imprudence.*

The basic character personifying imprudence is Nora, the wife of Torvald Helmer.

The crucible is *marriage.*

The elements of conflict in the crucible are: (1) Nora, personifying imprudence; (2) Torvald, Nora's husband, personifying integrity; (3) Krogstad, a lawyer, personifying desperation; (4) Mrs. Linden, personifying sacrifice.

The *complication* is the illness of Torvald and the forgery by Nora of her father's name to the note.

Let us trace the *plot:* Nora loves her husband (Torvald); Torvald has become ill, which necessitates a trip to Italy in order to save his life; the Helmers are without funds; it becomes necessary to secure the money to take the trip; Torvald is a character personifying *integrity*—he would not beg, borrow nor steal. We have then, the two characters in the crucible of

marriage—on the one hand, the imprudent wife (Nora) —on the other, the husband (Torvald) of inelastic integrity. As a result of Nora borrowing money on the forged note without the knowledge of her husband, it has become necessary for her to stint and save; Torvald secures a position at the bank; this comes to the knowledge of Mrs. Linden, an erstwhile friend; Mrs. Linden comes to the home of the Helmers; Nora, being a woman of kindly nature and compassion, readily agrees to aid Mrs. Linden in securing a position in the bank; the position which Mrs. Linden wishes to secure is the one formerly held by Krogstad, a lawyer; because Mrs. Linden is being pushed into the bank position Krogstad is being pushed out; this pushes Krogstad to appeal to Nora to use her influence to save his position; Nora is pushed to appeal to her husband, by reason of Krogstad's suggestion to her of the irregularity of the note; Nora, being pushed to appeal to her husband, his integrity pushes him to refuse her request; Torvald's refusal pushes Krogstad, through desperation, to threaten Nora; Nora, being threatened, is pushed to plead with her husband (Torvald); her husband, by virtue of his character (integrity) is pushed to refuse, the result of which pushes Krogstad to write a letter to Nora's husband, advising him of the forged note; Nora, having knowledge of Krogstad's letter, is pushed to resort to subterfuge in order to prevent her husband from reading the letter, is pushed to tell Mrs. Linden her trouble, is pushed to appeal to Mrs. Linden, is

pushed to urge Mrs. Linden to influence Krogstad; Mrs. Linden, personifying *sacrifice*, is pushed to meet Krogstad and, by subterfuge, agrees to marry him, which pushes Krogstad to return the note to Nora; the delay in returning the note pushes Nora and Torvald into the crisis of the play, wherein Nora ascertains that her husband is not the god that she had been led to believe he was; Nora is pushed into the realization of a broken idol; her illusion is destroyed; she is pushed into the conviction that married life between her and Torvald is impossible, and she is pushed to *slam the door*.

We have not undertaken to segregate each and every *push* in the plot, but have done so sufficiently to convey to the mind of the reader exactly what *plot* consists of. *Plot* is that which takes a character, or characters, away from one compartmented derivative situation and brings them into a succeeding derivative situation.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PLOT OF "THE MADRAS HOUSE"

If the plot of "A Doll's House" is dramatic perfection, the plot of "The Madras House" is dramatic imperfection. "The Madras House" opens in the home of the Huxtables; there are the father, the mother, and the six daughters. The preliminary directions describe the family. Philip Madras, the basic character, is described physically. The description of his emotions (all of which are subsidiary) are—kindness, coldness, keenness, metaphysical. As a matter of fact, not one of these constitute the basic or dominant emotion (the theme) of the play, to wit, morality. Philip Madras is more or less philosophical. The first act develops the six Huxtable girls, their father and mother; these girls are spinsters, and the problem of the household (constituting the narrative, plot or story of the first act) is concretely stated by a speech of Mrs. Huxtable (see "Chief Contemporary Dramatists," page 158).—

Mrs. Huxtable:

> I have always determined that my daughters should be sought after for themselves alone. That should insure their happiness. Any eligible gentleman who visits here constantly is always given to understand,

> delicately, that nothing need be expected from Mr. Huxtable beyond his approval. You are married, I think you said, Major Thomas.

Into this first act also is woven something of the difficulty that exists between the mother and father of Philip Madras; also an indication of the difficulty that has arisen in the Madras house in respect to Miss Yates and Brigstock, but none of this in any way involves Philip Madras and his morality, except in so far as he, by virtue of his position in the Madras house, is called upon to endeavor to maintain morality of the women employed there. The six Huxtable girls do not appear in the play after the first act, nor is their spinsterhood and more or less unhappy home shown to have any relevancy to what follows.

Act II. is entirely devoted to the development of a story involving Miss Yates' morality, Brigstock, who is suspected as guilty of her seduction, and Miss Chancellor, who is the mentor employed in the Madras house. Philip Madras, the basic character, is in charge of the investigation which is being made. The act deals with women (spinsterhood) and has relation to the basic character, Philip Madras, only in the relation that he bears to the Madras house.

The crucible of this play, women or womankind, which is also the orientation of the play and from which the story develops, is indicated in the speech of Miss Chancellor, as follows (page 171):

And self-respect. That's what the matter is. Are we beasts of the field, I should like to know? I simply do not understand this unladylike attitude towards the facts of life. Is there nothing for a woman to do in the world but to run after men . . . or pretend to run away from them? I am fifty-eight . . . and I have passed, thank God, a busy and a happy and I hope a useful life . . . and I have never thought any more or less of men than I have of any other human beings . . . or any differently. I look upon spinsterhood as an honorable state, as my Bible teaches me to. Men are different. But some women marry happily and well . . . and all women can't . . . and some can't marry at all. These facts have to be faced, I take it.

Philip says:

We may take it that Miss Yates has been facing them.

Miss Chancellor says:

Yes, sir, and in what spirit? I have always endeavored to influence the young ladies under my control towards the virtues of modesty and decorum . . . so that they may regard either state with an indifferent mind. If I can no longer do that, I prefer to resign my charge. I will say before this young person that I regret the story should have got about. But when any one has committed a fault it seems to me immaterial who knows of it.

This entire act is devoid of narrative, plot or story; it is a didactic discussion between Miss Chancellor, Miss Yates, Philip Madras and others, involving spins-

terhood—"a woman's fling," as Miss Yates describes her act, and has no motivation to the basic theme in so far as that theme is personified in the basic character, Philip Madras.

Act III. consists entirely of dialogue involving the sale of the Madras house to Mr. State (the American). Incidentally, there is much didactic discussion of the *woman* question; this is reflected typically in the speech of Mr. State at page 184. Mr. Huxable says to State:

> Is this how you mean to run your new Madras House?

Mr. State:

> Patience, Mr. Huxtable. It's but six months ago that I started to study the Woman Question from the point of view of Burrows & Co. I attended women's meetings in London, in Manchester, and in one-horse places as well. Now, political claims were but the narrowest, drabbest aspect of the matter as I saw it. The Woman's Movement is Woman expressing herself. Let us look at things as they are. What are a woman's chief means . . . how often her only means of expressing herself? Anyway . . . what is the first thing that she spends her money on? Clothes, gentlemen, clothes. Therefore, I say . . . though at Cannon Street we may palp with good ideas . . . the ready-made skirt is out of date . . .

The entire dialogue of this third act fails to travel through any gallery of portraits developed from cause to effect and motivated to a theme. In this act the

character of Constantine Madras is disclosed to be that of a polygamist and his reaction to womankind is indicated.

Act IV. is the development of a narrative involving Constantine Madras and his wife, who have been separated for years, and the basic character, Philip Madras, and his wife, Jessica. This act also develops that it was Constantine who had wronged Miss Yates. The act is a continuous debate upon women and their relation to the world, without any development of a plot from a causative character.

Mr. Archibald Henderson in "The Changing Drama" at page 137 says: "Barker's 'The Voysey Inheritance' and 'The Madras House,' with quite prosaic settings and a minimum of action, are essentially disquisitions, discussions in the form of a stage play."

At page 155 he says: "Of modern plays falling without the category of crisis may be mentioned . . . Barker's 'The Madras House' . . ."

At page 175 he says: "Impartial, many-sided discussion of a specific problem or a definite situation, devoid of real action save that of powerful cerebration—this is an accurate description of 'The Madras House' . . . Such a play is not a structural union of organic parts: it is a series of mental films of the same object taken from different angles. The speech of the characters, to employ a happy phrase of Meredith, 'rambles concentrically.' "

There can be no doubt but that the theme of "The

Madras House" is morality, and that Philip Madras is the basic character, personifying morality. The crucible of "The Madras House" is women or womankind. The difficulty with "The Madras House" is that it has three separate, distinct and independent actions and therefore is a disintegrated play. It is not true, however, to say, as does Mr. Henderson, that there is no crisis in "The Madras House." There is no crisis in the sense of a crisis in the life of the basic character, but there is a crisis when it is disclosed that the basic character's father, Constantine Madras, was the father of Miss Yates' child.

In Mr. Barrett H. Clark's "A Study of the Modern Drama," at page 281, it is stated: " 'The Madras House,' for example, judged by the standards of Pinero, is hardly a play at all; its artistic unity lies rather in the theme than in the actual plot.' "

Mr. William Archer says ("Play-Making), at page 190–191: "It is not easy to define the principle of unity in that brilliant comedy 'The Madras House'; but we nevertheless feel that a principle of unity exists; or, if we do not, so much the worse for the play and its author."

Mr. Archer says further, at page 330: "An even more remarkable play, 'The Madras House,' was ruined, on its first night, by a long final anti-climax. Here, however, the fault did not lie in awakening a premature expectation of the close, but in the fact that we somehow were more interested in the other characters

of the play than in the pair who held the stage throughout the long concluding scene."

In Mr. Barker's "Dramatic Technique," at page 278, the stage directions of "The Madras House" are criticized by Mr. Barker. Mr. Barker excerpts at length the description of Julia. The real criticism that may be directed against "The Madras House" is that a character such as Julia is in truth irrelevant to the play. The play involves the morality of women, and Julia is irrelevant, in that she forms no part of the organic structure.

Clayton Hamilton, in his "Studies in Stagecraft," at page 94, says: ". . . what are we to do with such a play as Mr. Granville Barker's 'The Madras House'? This piece reveals no definite beginning; and the author has deliberately planned it in such a way that it shall show no end. Structurally, this work is, so to speak, a succession of four middles. The final stage-direction reads, 'She doesn't finish, for really there is no end to the subject'; and then the curtain falls, to cut us off from our momentary participation in a dozen lives which are considered as continuous and as undetermined as our own."

Mr. Charlton Andrews ("The Technique of Playwriting," page 189) says: "There is, to be sure, the so-called 'comedy of atmosphere,' which is a mere representation of some specific phase of existence, without emphasis upon either plot or character. 'The Weavers' of Hauptmann and 'The Madras House' of

Barker belong in this class—neither of them calculated to make a popular appeal in the theatre. In view of the attitude common to the mass of playgoers, the dramatist certainly should select from the lives of the real men and women he is putting into his comedy or his tragedy those possible incidents and episodes of conflict which not only best reveal the characters themselves but can also be arranged in an orderly and climacteric series adapted to the maintenance of suspense. Beyond doubt, it requires much skill and patience to do this well—far more, indeed, than merely to troop the personages, cinematographically across the stage in insignificant disorder—but the effort is richly worth the while."

CHAPTER XV

COMPARTMENTED BY DERIVATIVE SITUATIONS

This is the fifth element in the organic structure. We have coined a dramatic expression, to wit, "compartmented," or "compartmentation," in order to have definite and specific terminology in respect to what is invariably characterized in playwriting criticism as "episodes, events, incidents, accidents, altercations, provocations, sentiments."

As has been indicated in the preceding chapter, the "Narrative, Plot or Story" causatively chains, threads or links the events together. Each and every episode, event, incident, accident, altercation, provocation or sentiment should be susceptible to definitive *compartmentation* and should constitute what the writer is pleased to characterize as a "derivative situation"; that is to say, each episode should be the direct or indirect result or cross-current of a causative character in action. In a logical play each specific episode should, either mentally or psychologically, be reducible to a beginning, a middle and an end in the same measure that the play, in the aggregate, should have a beginning, a middle and an end. In this way the true causative nature of the episode is held to unity. The derivative situation should be one in which the causative char-

acter appears in a scene with one or more secondary characters, or a scene in which secondary characters appear in the evolution of the causative chain of sequential events.

The compartmented derivative situations are to be contra-distinguished from the basic dramaturgical theme, that is, the basic situation, the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, which has been selected (Element A) as the primal cause of the play and from which and/or to which the play is motivated and orientated.

The basic or dominant emotion of the causative character is the basic situation. Jealousy in a human being is a fundamental organic dramatic situation. A jealous human being lives and dies in the agony of hell. The stronger and more emphatic the basic situation (basic emotion selected as the theme of the play), the more emphatic the dramaturgy.

Compartmented by derivative situations means the process, either mental or physical, by which the craftsman visualizes to the audience the basic emotion which he has personified by character and motivated through the five C's the narrative, plot or story which is being progressed and which constitutes the action or fictional complex of the play. Let us again take "A Doll's House" for illustration—the text makes Nora say, page 194:

> . . . He (Torvald) had to undertake all sorts of extra work, you know, and to slave early and late. He

couldn't stand it, and fell dangerously ill. Then the doctors declared he must go to the South.

Mrs. Linden says:

You spent a whole year in Italy, didn't you?

Nora says:

Yes, we did. It wasn't easy to manage, I can tell you. It was just after Ivar's birth. But of course we had to go. Oh, it was a wonderful, delicious journey! And it saved Torvald's life. But it cost a frightful lot of money, Christina.

In this dialogue we have the compartmented situation of Torvald being dangerously ill. The psychology of this situation is readily understood by an audience. The emotional reaction immediately excites the interest of the audience and the audience visualizes the derivative situation which confronted Nora. Torvald was a man of integrity; he had married; Nora had had a child; Torvald was compelled to slave early and late, as a man of integrity would; he could not stand it and fell dangerously ill. This compartmentation has a beginning, a middle and an end and is a playlet within itself.

Again, Torvald being a man of integrity and a slave to his integrity, was unable to do anything to help himself financially. Therefore, the raising of the money ($1200.) depended upon Nora; in order to get it she forged her father's name to a note and borrowed the money from Krogstad. Here is a derivative situation

of perfect compartmentation. The direct effect of the primal cause—imprudence on the part of Nora—integrity on the part of Torvald. With a husband of the integrity of Torvald, and a wife of the imprudence of Nora in the crucible of marriage, with dangerous illness and no money, it was a natural thing for Nora, having a little understanding of the verities of life, to forge the note. This derivative situation is a playlet within itself.

Again, after the husband had gone to Italy and his health had been rebuilt, in order for Nora to meet the payments of instalments and interest on the outstanding note which was unknown to her husband, she was compelled to stint and save, which was contrary to her nature. This derivative situation was the immediate effect of what had gone before and an audience readily visualizes the agony suffered by Nora in these circumstances.

Again, Torvald secures the bank position, with increased earnings, which betters the condition of the Helmer family and brings into the house physical comforts and social progress; this is taking place at or about the time that Mrs. Linden comes. Nora, having heard Mrs. Linden's recitation of accomplishment, becomes proud and imprudent and makes a confident of Mrs. Linden; she tells Mrs. Linden how she saved Torvald's life; how she found the money; details everything to Mrs. Linden, except the forgery—all of the recitation being extremely imprudent.

Again, we have a perfect compartmented situation when Mrs. Linden is about to secure Krogstad's position and Krogstad appears to Nora. This derivative situation emphasizes Nora's imprudence. And so, from one derivative situation to another the story of Nora and Torvald in their marital complex is unfolded. The reader can readily pursue the compartmentation.

In practically every treatise or discussion existent the expression "dramatic situation" is used in a confusing way. Invariably the phrase "dramatic situation" is used by writers in the concept of plot, theme or orientation. As a matter of fact, neither plot, orientation, or compartmented derivative situation is ever the basic dramaturgical theme. The basic dramaturgical theme is an emotion. Inasmuch as it is from the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, that the entire play is evolved, and it is back to this basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, to which every element of the play must inductively ascend, it is therefore important and essential that the reader contra-distinguish the basic or primary dramaturgical situation, that is, the basic emotion—the theme of the play from which the derivative situations which constitute the various and succeeding compartmentations through which the narrative, plot or story travels and threads its way. It is only in definite terminology which clearly and perfectly demonstrates the distinction that the mind may perceive and fix the line of demarcation between the basic primary dramaturgical

situation, that is, the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion constituting the theme, and the derivative situations in the play. If we conceive of a derivative situation in the sense of a compartment, we can readily grasp the distinction. "Compartmentation"—"Compartmented"—that is to say, a distinct and independent dramatic complication, incident or episode which may be segregated either mentally or physically; one which in and of itself may, if developed and elaborated, constitute a playlet.

The compartmentation, or compartmented derivative situation should be so written, visualized and constructed that it could be picked out of the play and in and of itself made into a sketch or playlet. These compartments or compartmented derivative situations must be chained together, linked or connected by the progression of the narrative, plot or story, that is to say, any compartment or compartmented situation which is not the effect of a preceding cause, directly or indirectly traceable inductively to the basic emotion, or which does not constitute a cross-current, hurdle or barrier, should not be in the play. Each compartmented derivative situation, to be relevant in a scientific organic structure, must have direct or indirect relation to the basic emotion; for example, every current and every stream in the play must, at some point, feed into the causative current from which the play is evolved. If the compartmented situation—however dramatic it may be in and of itself—has no direct or in-

direct relation to the basic emotion, it ceases to be, or, as a matter of fact, never was a derivative situation and has no place in the play.

One should always bear in mind that the basic dramaturgical situation, that is, the basic emotion, or element in or of a basic emotion, which constitutes the theme of the play, is the direct and proximate cause of each and every succeeding element in the play; in other words, "The Science of Playwriting" demands the logical development of the play.

The basic emotion is the immediate psychological propulsion merged into the personification of the character who moves and has his being and whose every act in the play is directly motivated to the psychic impulse which created him. The play must be so compartmented that the derivative situations may be traceable to the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, by processes of induction and deduction.

Let us now indicate illustrative derivative situations:

In "A False Saint" the basic emotion constituting the theme is penance. The first derivative situation or episode is a subjective one and is not physically portrayed in the play; it is the episode or incident of Julie nearly killing Jeanne; as a result of Julie's conduct in respect to Jeanne, she (Julie) went to the convent; when the play opens Henri, whom Julie loved, is dead; the gate of penance opens; Julie comes home and the play carries on each and every episode motivating the primal cause of the play. When Julie learns from

Christine that Henri really loved her (Julie), and when she realizes that her attitude towards his child (Christine) was of the same character as her attitude towards Jeanne, she (Julie) reverts to her metaphysical antecedent—*penance*. The play "A False Saint" is the causative chain of sequential events, motivating retrospectively, as indicated by Goethe, to the primal cause. One may spend an interesting hour comparing the evolution of "A False Saint," from the theme of *penance*, with "Michael and His Lost Angel," which also is the evolution of the theme of *penance*.

In "The Mob" there is the tragic episode when Katherine, the wife of Stephen More, leaves her home. More says:

> For God's sake, put your pride away, and see! I'm fighting for the faith that's in me. What else can a man do? What else? Ah! Kit, do see!

Katherine says:

> I'm strangled here! Doing nothing—sitting silent—when my brothers are fighting, and being killed. I shall try to go out nursing. Helen will come with me. I have my faith too; my poor common love of country. I can't stay here with you. I spent last night on the floor—thinking—and I know!

This derivative situation is the direct result of the basic emotion courage, personified in Stephen More. Stephen More held to the courage of his convictions.

The derivative situation was the loss of his wife and child.

In "Justice" Falder raised a check from £9 to £90. This derivative situation or episode was the direct result of Falder's madness for a helpless woman.

In "The Fugitive" Clare leaves her husband and home. This episode in her life was the direct result of her desperation over a loveless marriage.

In "The Pigeon" Ferrand, the alien, says [*approaching the picture*]:

> Ah! You are always working at this. You will have something of very good there, Monsieur. You wish to fix the type of wild savage existing ever amongst our high civilization . . . How anxious are the tame birds to do the wild birds good. [*His voice changes.*] For the wild birds it is not funny. There is in some human souls, Monsieur, what cannot be made tame.

Here is a derivative situation or episode visualized subjectively, which is directly motivated to the theme of charity and succinctly and logically presents the idea as to whether charity of this character is not, in reality, throwing pearls before swine.

In "The Thunderbolt" Helen Thornhill says:

> Quite impossible. I could not be a party— Please understand me— I refuse to be a party to any steps which would bring ruin on Mrs. Mortimore.

Elkin says [*shyly*]:

> You refuse——?

Helen:

> Absolutely. At any cost— At any cost to me— We must all unite in sparing her and her husband and child.

Here is a derivative situation—an episode—motivating directly to the basic emotion or theme *consideration,* which the basic character, Helen Thornhill, an illegitimate child of a dead brother, extends to her uncle and aunt.

In "The Wild Duck" Hialmar [*with his hand upon the door handle*] says to Gina:

> In these, the last moments I spend in my former home, I wish to be spared from interlopers— [*Goes into the room.*]

Hedvig [*with a bound towards her mother, asks softly, trembling*]:

> Does he mean me?

Gina says:

> Stay out in the kitchen, Hedvig; or, no—you'd best go into your own room. [*Speaks to* HIALMAR *as she goes in to him.*] Wait a bit, Ekdal; don't rummage so in the drawers; I know where everything is.

Hedvig [*stands a moment immovable, in terror and perplexity, biting her lips to keep back the tears; then she clenches her hands convulsively, and says softly*]:

The wild duck. [*She steals over and takes the pistol from the shelf, opens the garret door a little way, creeps in, and draws the door to after her.*]

This derivative situation or episode, wherein Hedvig, the interloper, realizing her helplessness, prepares to suicide; the situation is directly motivated to her basic emotion of innocence.

In "The Madras House" the compartmented situations are, with few exceptions, entirely unrelated and not derivative from the theme.

A clean-cut play in respect to derivative situations is that of "The Truth," by Clyde Fitch. Practically every derivative situation may be motivated inductively to the lying of Becky Warder.

CHAPTER XVI

DRESSED UP BY INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

THIS is the sixth constituent element of the scientific play and is classification "F." There are twelve subdivisions in classification "F," being part of Incidental Detailed Construction. These subdivisions are of great importance in respect to *inductive* and *deductive* correlation to the basic theme, and of vital importance in respect to what has often been characterized by various authors and writers—(Price) "the division into acts; the division into scenes; preparation; entrances and exits; scenery; (Baker) preparation; arrangement; (Archer) the first act; overshadowing; preparation; details; (Wilde) expository device; preparation; mechanical processes; (Prof. B. Roland Lewis) stage direction; stage setting."

FIRST ELEMENT OF INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The first element of Incidental Detailed Construction is that contained and involved in the *secondary characters*, who are placed in a play for the purpose of serv-

ing either as foils for the basic character or characters, thus progressing and advancing the other elements in the play, or involving forecasting, preparation, suspense, or metaphysical antecedents. The reader may consult other standard books dealing more in detail with the mechanical technique of craftsmanship.

Many playwrights delight in having one or more of the secondary characters personify the same basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, as the basic or primary character or characters personify;—for example: In the play "The Outsider" several of the secondary characters personify the same basic emotion as the basic or central character in the play. It is an uncertain and unsatisfactory, and more or less dangerous thing, to have any one or more of the secondary characters personify the same basic emotion as the basic or central character, for the following reasons: There is always the possibility that the characterization will reflect too much similarity and may prove confusing and uninteresting; it is a difficult matter, when the secondary characters personify the same basic emotion as the basic or central character to "flatten" or "soft-pedal" the secondary characters and stress and emphasize the basic character so that the basic character may easily be seen and visualized as the dominating force in the play; when secondary characters personify the same basic emotion as the basic or primary character there is also danger of the resultant impression that the playwright is speaking, rather than the char-

acters. Each secondary character should have a distinct personality and activity, save and except when secondary characters represent a mob or mass scene. Each secondary character in a scientifically constructed play should personify a distinct and independent emotion. Such an emotion so personified by the secondary character should, however, be so subdued that the audience may not be deceived or misled in any particular as to the dominating character in the play. There should, as a matter of fact, never be any confusion in the mind of the audience as to the basic theme of the play. The theme of the play should be clear, lucid and easily understood; the relation of the basic character personifying the basic theme in contradiction to the secondary characters should never rest in doubt in the mind of the audience. The secondary characters should be invented or created personifying (or in characterization) an emotion which will serve either one of the following purposes: The emotion of a secondary character should be one which will lend itself aid to the basic character in personifying the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion; or, the secondary character should be one personifying an emotion which is in direct conflict or antagonism with the emotion of the basic character; or, the secondary character should personify an emotion which will be helpful in introducing incidental, yet necessary, elements into the play; or, the secondary characters should personify an emotion which will symbolize some element of nature which

is a constituent part of the conflict of the play; or, the secondary character should personify an emotion which may become necessary in order to create complication and/or intrigue in the play; or, the secondary character should personify an emotion which will be a causative force in bringing about a crisis in the play. ✓

The truly scientific play is in essence a struggle or contest of emotions. Many plays are written where the secondary characters are absolutely devoid of emotion. Some secondary characters are written into the play to represent some trait or characteristic which may not be traceable causatively to any definite emotion. Secondary characters are often written into a play when they have no direct or indirect relation to the basic emotion. More often secondary characters are written into the play when they are perfect nondescripts. There is no more fascinating phase of the study of organic structure than to analyze famous plays and to ascertain how the author of these plays made them dramatic.

In "A Doll's House," where the crucible or pot in which the play is boiled is that of marriage, the basic emotion is imprudence, personified in the wife, Nora. The personification of Torvald, who is the leading secondary character, is integrity.—Given a man and a woman in marriage, the woman's basic emotion being imprudence and the man's basic emotion being integrity, psychology would immediately say that the marriage must, sooner or later, get on the rocks. A woman whose basic emotion is imprudence, and man

whose basic emotion is integrity, will inevitably, by the very nature of their conflicting emotions and psychology, get into complication which will inevitably result in crisis.

In "Ghosts" Ibsen created his basic character in the son, Oswald Alving. He gave to Oswald the basic emotion of dread. This is the primary theme of the play. The dread which dominated the son Oswald grew out of his heritage, which was disease, due to his father's dissolute character. Oswald Alving's mother, who is the first secondary character, was given the emotion of cowardice. Let us examine this situation from a psychological aspect:—Given a mother whose emotion is cowardice, and a son whose basic emotion is dread, with a heritage to the son based upon disease, due to a dissolute father, one can easily see how the mother's cowardice in not facing the issue and guiding her son from infancy would inflict the sorrows that Mrs. Alving suffered when her son came to maturity and, without her support either morally or spiritually, ascertained the viciousness of his ancestry. The secondary character in "Ghosts" is Pastor Manders, who personifies the emotion of duty. It is Pastor Manders' psychological actions, bottomed on his basic emotion of duty, which brings about, in a large degree, the complication between Oswald Alving and his mother.

"The Wild Duck" is a splendid illustration of scientific playwriting. The basic emotion is innocence, personified in the fourteen-year old child Hedvig, sym-

bolized as "The Wild Duck." This play has as its crucible marriage. The marriage is between Hialmar Ekdal, who personifies the basic emotion of integrity, and Gina Ekdal, who personifies the basic emotion deception. Immediately visioning a marriage between a man whose basic emotion is integrity, and a woman whose basic emotion is deception, we know that trouble is going to ensue. In "The Wild Duck" this trouble is highly dramatic. Hedvig, the fourteen-year-old daughter, personifying innocence, is, as a matter of fact, the child of Werle, Sr.; Hedvig becoming blind proves this. The play gradually develops the fact that Hedvig is the daughter of Werle, Sr., who personifies corruption. Werle, Sr. had been intimate with Gina; Gina married Hialmar Ekdal without disclosing to him her illicit relations, and which illicit relations she continued even after her marriage. Gregers Werle, an important secondary character, personifies integrity. Given a play in which the major character represents or personifies innocence, the two leading secondary characters (husband and wife) personify integrity and deception, other important secondary characters personify corruption and integrity, and we immediately have elements of conflict which, in the very nature of things, will develop a story in which complication, intrigue and crisis will develop.

In Massinger's play "A New Way to Pay Old Debts," where the basic emotion and theme is intrigue, personified in Sir Giles Overreach, who is acting with sec-

ondary characters personifying the basic emotions of greed and deceit, and where the subject and object of Sir Giles' intrigue, and that of his supporting characters (greed and deceit) involves the secondary character Wellborn, a prodigal, whose basic emotion is confidence, these characters being in contact and conflict with Tom Allworth, whose basic emotion is gratitude, it may readily be seen how these elements will, in the very nature of things, produce a dramatic crisis.

It often happens that a secondary character is the showy, attractive or colorful character in the play; for example, in "Magda" Magda is a secondary character; in "The Servant in the House" the Bishop of Benares is the colorful character, nevertheless, a secondary character; in "Polly Preferred" Polly is a secondary character but the showy character. In "Lady Windemere's Fan" Mrs. Erlynne, a secondary character, in many respects is a more attractive and showy character than Lady Windemere. In "The Madras House" several of the secondary characters are more colorful than the basic character (Philip Madras). In "The Red Robe," by virtue of the tertiary action, several of the secondary characters are more colorful than Mouzon, personifying torture, the basic theme. In "The Father" the theme, which is madness, personified in the causative character of a cavalry captain, the secondary character Laura, his wife, whose dominant emotion is tyranny, is in many respects a more colorful character.

SECOND ELEMENT OF INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

Strata of Society: The second element of incidental detailed construction has relation not only to the causative character, but to the secondary characters. It is the province of the craftsman to determine the strata of society from which his characters are drawn; this determination will depend upon many considerations, among others, the basic emotion constituting the theme. The strata of society is an important consideration, for when the craftsman undertakes to motivate through the five C's, the selection of characters becomes one of moment:—Illustratively—if the basic emotion and theme is ambition, personified by the causative character, the play must thread its way through an action where *ambition* is active. One does not look for ambition in the underworld. Albeit, ambition may fight from out of the depths. One would not ordinarily anticipate ambition among cobblers or hostlers.

The Strata of Society must not be disintegrated or inharmonious with the theme; there must be a sense of correlation and discrimination. In ancient drama *tragedy* was always placed in the highest strata of society. The nationality of a character does not characterize; the profession or vocation of a character does not characterize. The same emotions are experienced by Frenchmen, Americans, Russians or Chinese. Mr.

Archibald Henderson, in "The Changing Drama," at page 20 says: "There is a marked similarity, often identity of form in the dramas of men and women of different nationalities."

Inasmuch as emotion is biological and eternal, character does not change. The mechanism of the world may change, but man remains the same.

Mr. Archibald Henderson says further ("The Changing Drama," page 126): "It cannot be denied that the naturalists have produced powerful and gripping dramas, more appalling through the squalor of the scenes and happenings than elevating through the beauty of the story. Assuredly, the remorselessness of the treatment, combined with the repulsiveness of the characters involved, have given rise to the not unnatural, but unwarranted, critical common-place that the naturalist wishes to shock and horrify his audience with the drab pictures of poverty, misery, criminality, and degeneracy. From the philosophic standpoint, the naturalist is intent upon exhibiting, in the most effective way, the influences of environment and heredity upon human character and action. In consequence, he chooses his subjects and scenes from those classes of society which exhibit the operation of these forces in the most striking way. Indeed, the citizens of the fourth estate, the petty artisans, the humbler peasantry, the submerged tenth in the cosmopolitan centres, crooks, tramps, thugs, criminals—in these lower forms of humanity, character is least volitional

and creative. In such social strata are most glaringly patent the tragic consequences of hereditary ills and proclivities, the direful influences of surroundings calculated to retard and arrest all intellectual and spiritual development."

George Lillo, in 1713, first departed from the idea that tragedy must necessarily be written in the aristocratic strata of society. The reader will find Mr. Henderson's discussion upon this phase of craftsmanship extremely entertaining and instructive.

Plays should be studied in relation to the strata of society of the characters. Following are illustrative cases:

In "Mrs. Dane's Defence" the characters are apparently drawn from polite society—Sir Daniel Carteret is a lawyer; Mrs. Dane was anxious to find a place in polite society; she was planning to marry Sir Daniel's adopted son. The other secondary characters, aside from the menials, were what may be characterized as polite, respectable English people.

In "A False Saint" the strata of society is middle class.

In "The Magistrate" the strata of society is middle class.

In "The Mollusc" the strata of society is middle class.

In "Hindle Wakes" the origin of the various characters was rather lowly. The principal characters rose to place and affluence through struggle and integrity.

In "Magda" the basic character (Schwartze) is an army man; the majority of the characters are in the middle class strata.

In "Countess Julia" the basic character is of the nobility; Jean is a valet; Christina is the cook. The selection of the strata of society here constitutes one of the organic elements of the play, that is to say, the play is largely orientated upon the physical contact of a countess with her man-servant.

In "A New Way to Pay Old Debts" the strata of society is largely in the nobility.

In "The Fool" the strata of society of the various characters is largely mixed, some of the characters being middle class—a few capitalists—the larger number most humble. It was necessary in "The Fool" to have these characters sharply differentiated and the author's endeavor in that behalf is extremely successful.

THIRD ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

Locale: Locale, or place, constituted one of the original Aristotelian unities. In ancient drama it was thought impossible to present a play where the locale changed or varied. This theory of unity of place was latterly discarded. The original theory of unity in respect to locale or place was maintained in order to secure illusion. The modern theatre has entirely destroyed this theory; nevertheless, in writing drama

one must keep in mind correlation and sequence; one cannot transfer a number of characters coincidently from place to place willy nilly.

The locale may or may not be of vital importance in the play. In some plays the locale is a vital element in the organic structure; for example: in the play "White Cargo" the locale is Africa and it visualizes and symbolizes the basic theme or emotion—despair. As a matter of fact, it is Africa that creates the despair which is personified in the basic character, Langford.

In the play "Sun Up" the locale played an important part. This play could not have been successfully visualized in an East Side tenement. The characters find their habitat only in the southern mountains of the United States. In plays of this character the locale must be such as will give unity and harmony to the organic structure. It is entirely possible in the writing of a play for the selection of the locale to dominate, in a large degree, the entire structure of the play.

In "Hindle Wakes" the locale had to be a mill town. The play deals almost entirely with mill people in England.

FOURTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The Acts: The fourth element in incidental detailed construction is the acts. The determination on the part of the playwright as to the number of acts

constituting the play is not to be ignored. The division of the play into acts may affect the organic structure. A significant illustration of this is found in the play "The Fool." In the first act the crucible of the play is *the church;* in the second act the crucible is *capital and labor;* in the third act the crucible is *settlement work;* in the fourth act the crucible is in Gilchrist's room upstairs Christmas Eve—peace. The division of this play into four acts and the creation of an independent crucible in each act is not only an extraordinary adventure in play construction, but it necessitates the division of the play into the four acts.

Often, as in Pinero's play "The Magistrate," the division into acts divides or separates the play in its structural aspect. In "The Magistrate" Act I. is described as "The Family Skeleton"; Act II. "It leaves its Cupboard"; Act III. "It Crumbles."

FIFTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The Scene or Scenes: There is no element in the play of an inanimate nature more conducive to fine exposition of the basic emotion or theme than the scene or scenes. The play "Expressing Willie" is a fine illustration of the power of a scene.—In the first act of this play the audience visualizes a tremendous living-room; every feature of this living-room emphasizes and accentuates the basic emotion or theme of the play, to

wit, fear. A vision of this living-room registers fear as unmistakably as if it were haunted by ghosts.

In Ibsen's "The Wild Duck," Act II., the direction refers to a scene as follows:

> . . . Through the open doorway a large, deep irregular garret is seen with odd nooks and corners; a couple of stove-pipes running through it, from rooms below. There are skylights through which clear moonbeams shine in on some parts of the great room; others lie in deep shadow.

This garret is the abode of poultry and animals kept by Ekkal, Sr., and where he indulges in his illusion. This scene is a vital one in the organic structure of the play, in that among other occupants of the room is a wild duck, this being also the title of the play and being a symbol of the basic character in the play, the fourteen-year-old daughter Hedvig. It is in this garret at the end of the play that Hedvig, as a result of her mother's irregular life and her assumed father's abandonment of her, committed suicide.

The scene or scenes have, in a large measure, to do with the artistry of a play. In "The Dove," by Willard Mack, the crucible of the play being sporting, or sporting life, the first scene, the Purple Pigeon Café in Mexicana, Mexico, as well as Brayfield's Gambling House, in the second act, are significant parts of the organic structure of the play. One could not easily place a play, in which the crucible was sporting life, in a church or convent.

SIXTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The Props: Many plays depend in a large measure for their success upon the selection of what may be characterized "impressive" or "personified props." In "The Wild Duck" the duck is a prop. In "The Outsider" the mechanical rack used by the outsider is one of the important elements in the play; it practically assumes the dignity of a character, for it figuratively lives and breathes and has its being in the personality of its creator—the "outside doctor." The entire play "The Outsider" orientates from this rack; it is this rack which is considered to be the handiwork of a charlatan or quack that is despised by the doctors who constitute the "insiders." The "insiders' " opposition to the "outsider" is motivated in a large measure upon their antagonism to the "outsider's" invention—the rack—this being the thing, the prop, which enables the "outsider" to argue his capacity and effectiveness.

In "The Wild Duck" the pistol is an important prop.

As a rule, props are significant points of preparation in the original construction of the play.

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the fan is an essential part of the play and is utilized by the author in a large measure in building the complication.

In "The Witching Hour" props figure prominently in the technique and dramaturgy of the play. A cat's eye and a paper knife speak as strongly as the characters.

In "Scarecrow" the scarecrow emphasizes the use of props.

In "Pelleas and Melisande" the ring that Melisande lost in the water is a significant feature in the play.

SEVENTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The Lighting: In modern play construction there is no element more essential than the lighting. Stage lighting has progressed and advanced rapidly following the invention of the incandescent light. There is no finer vehicle for registering a basic emotion or theme than modern stage lighting effectively employed. One's emotions are, as a rule, aroused by the use and effect of lights and shades. In many plays (illustrative class "White Cargo") lighting is of the very essence of the organic structure. It was necessary in "White Cargo" to show the burning sands, the blistering sun—being the elements of nature which created despair. This is all effectively done by lighting.

EIGHTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

Costumes or Clothes: The advice of Polonius to Laertes in "Hamlet"—"The apparel oft proclaims the man"—is a fine illustration of the value of costuming or clothing in a play. Often a character is wholly or partially personified or visualized in the clothing he

wears. Carlyle wrote a splendid book entitled "Sartor Resartus," or, "Clothes Philosophy." Carlyle understood the tremendous part that clothes play in any compartmentation of life. Many plays in recent years have been written or orientated from the viewpoint of clothes. "The Tailor-Made Man" is an illustration; "Pygmalion," by Bernard Shaw, and "Polly with a Past," by Guy Bolton and George Middleton, may be examined with interest.

NINTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The Period: It is of importance that the period selected for the play should be one lending unity and harmony to the basic emotion personified by character and motivated through crucible, conflict, complication and/or intrigue to ultimate crisis and climax. The period has direct relation to the characterization. It would not do to construct a Civil War play in the twentieth century. Each period or cycle of time in history is distinctive and the playwright must appreciate the value of exactness in characterization in harmony and unity with the period.

TENTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

The Time: The tenth element in incidental detailed construction is the time. This was one of the original

Aristotelian unities (see Barrett H. Clark's "Study of a Modern Drama," pages 269, 270, 300). In the Greek drama the action was limited to a day. This so-called law no longer obtains. However, there is the unity of time. The orderly processes of logical and scientific playwriting demand that due regard be given to the time, not only in respect to days, weeks, or years, but hours and fractional parts of hours. The unity of a play, its harmony, probability, reasonableness, its sequence may be destroyed if the craftsman disregards the element of time. The unity of time has been discussed by practically every technician and critic. The treatises of Mr. Baker and Mr. Archer may be consulted with profit. Unity of time as originally understood, like unity of place, had relation particularly to the sense of illusion. The modern stage has practically eliminated many of the ancient theories of technique.

ELEVENTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

Entrances: A compartmented situation, one which will arouse an audience to laughter or frenzy, or carry it into despondency or despair, may be accomplished through an entrance. In the play "Abie's Irish Rose" interest and suspense are built up planting the idea of the on-coming of Patrick Murphy, father of Rose Mary. In this play the interest of the audience is aroused to such an extent that, when Patrick Murphy is at the

door with the priest whom he has brought from California (the stage being empty and the characters unseen), the noise at the door indicating the entrance of the Irish father (Murphy) and the priest, Father Whalen, the audience bursts into laughter and enthusiasm. ✓

Into the play "White Cargo," separate and apart from the entrances of the basic character or the secondary characters, the symbolism of the river boat that comes to the wharf bringing news and contact of the outside world and which is used also to bring the new white victim to the land of despair, is a vital and potent element in the organic structure.

Technique has varied throughout the centuries in respect to entrances. It is not an uncommon thing in modern playwriting for a basic character to be present on the stage at the rise of the curtain, and invariably at the beginning of the first act.

TWELFTH ELEMENT IN INCIDENTAL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION

✓ *Exit:* In the play "A Doll's House" Ibsen has immortalized an exit "the slam of a door." Nora, whose illusions and ideals in respect to her husband, Torvald, have been destroyed, and who has come to a realization that she cannot live with a man of Torvald's narrow integrity, leaves the house, slams the door and ends the play. ✓

In the play "White Cargo" the entrances and exits are symbolized in the organic structure of the play in the arrival and departure of the river boat. This arrival and departure of the boat is concretely interwoven with the theme of the play—despair. The boat brings a message from civilization and carries the victims of despair from Africa back to civilization.

In Ibsen's "The Wild Duck" the exit of Hedvig into the abode of the "wild duck," and the pistol shot, constitute an exit which is powerful and interwoven in the very organic structure of the play.

In "The Judge," by Maxim Gorky, the exit is the suicide of the causative character, Ivan.

In "Hedda Gabler" the causative character likewise suicides.

In "The Fugitive" the causative character suicides.

CHAPTER XVII

ORIENTATION

✓ ORIENTATION is the seventh element of the organic structure of a play. The Algebraic Formula reads: "plus the underlying idea orientated through its constituent elements as dramaturgically expressed." This means the adjustment, in an orderly and scientific way, of the various elements of the play contained in the Algebraic Formula, comprehending and including consecutiveness, continuity, correlation, and may be either mental and/or physical.✓

Whilst in the Algebraic Formula *orientation* is classified as the seventh element, the reader should not have any misconception as to its importance. Practically every writer misconceives *orientation* for *theme.* Orientation is not theme. As a matter of fact, the greatest number of plays have their inception from *an idea,* and it is a common error of playwrights to misconceive this idea as *theme.* A play must be orientated from an idea and/or its basic theme. In any event, the adjustment must be logical; there must be unity and harmony, as well as clearness. Mr. Charlton Andrews ("Technique of Playwriting," pages 19–20) sets forth play after play in which he misconceives orientation for theme. Without entering into an an-

alysis of all the instances cited by Mr. Andrews for the purpose of emphasizing the present point, we refer to his statement at page 20 as to *theme:* " . . . In 'The Blue Bird,' how happiness, which men are prone to seek far afield, oftenest lies at home." This is orientation from an idea and not theme.

In the play "Captain Applejack" there is practically the same orientation,—the real estate agent (Jason) had encouraged Ambrose to sell his home and find youth in adventure and romance abroad, when, as a matter of fact, Ambrose had romance and adventure in his own household.

Mr. Baker says (Dramatic Technique," page 111): "Some central idea, plan, purpose, whatever we choose to call it, must give the play organic structure. Story is the first step to this."

✓This is a very confusing statement. A play may be orientated from some central idea (and it is entirely in order for the playwright to adopt some central idea as a point of orientation), but before he undertakes to complete the organic structure of the play he must establish the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, which he intends to correlate with the central idea from which the play is orientated. Story is not the first step to this. It is far more important to select the character and to define the character who will personify the basic emotion. Next it is important for the playwright to choose the conflicting emotions which he intends to set up as elements of conflict in opposition

to the emotion of the basic character. Coincident with this selection is that of the selection of the crucible, for after the theme is secured and the personification of the basic emotion, the next succeeding element in the organic structure is that of motivation, which runs through crucible, conflict, complication and/or intrigue, crisis and climax.

Orientation may be described as "measure for measure," that is to say, the sense of weighing and adjusting each and every part of the play so that it does not wander or run amuck, or contain irrelevant matter. Mr. Wilde ("The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play," page 66), referring to "The Slave with Two Faces," by Miss Mary Carolyn Davies, quotes: " 'Remember!' says the principal character, 'you are only safe—as long as you remain his master. Never forget that he is a slave, and that you are a queen.' "

Mr. Wilde says: "Here is a theme that instantly projects itself into dramatic action." This is not a theme in any circumstance; it is orientation from an idea.

It is doubtless true that the greater number of all the plays which have been written have had their inception or genesis in orientation from an idea. The initiative processes through which the prospective play has its period of gestation are invariably the processes of orientation. The idea is born in the crucible or pot of life. The idea is the chrysalis that ultimately wings its flight—as the butterfly from flower to flower. Plays

are often orientated from a title or an idea contained in a title; often from some theory, phase or problem of life. ✓When the playwright fixes upon an idea as his matrix for the play and undertakes to orientate the play from that idea (being classification "G," or the seventh element), the immediate scientific and logical step to take is from G to A; that is to say, select a basic emotion which will most perfectly admit of logical orientation from the idea and which will, for the playwright's purpose, lend itself most easily to the construction of the play. The orientation must travel through each succeeding element of the Algebraic Formula, welding the basic emotion into each and every element of the play, and must not be lost sight of in the travel of the play from the beginning to the end. ✓

As illustrative of the general misconception of orientation for theme, we quote Prof. Lewis ("The Technique of the One-Act Play," page 91): The actual concrete sources of themes for One-Act plays are many and varied. Actual current happenings, episodes, incidents in every-day life; conversations, exchange of ideas and sentiments with acquaintances; suddenly aroused emotional functioning provoked by reading, by hearing a story or a lecture, or by observing some moving scene; one's own personal experiences of a more or less significant nature—comic or tragic; newspaper accounts of happenings which seem to sum up the outcome of antecedent causes real or imaginary; suddenly conceived ideas, or sudden impulses; study of

human motives and human personalities among one's associates; and particularly the author's own study of his own self with a view to determining his own real inner nature—these are some of the specific sources from which, as in a twinkling of an eye, a dramatic theme may come to one's consciousness. Once recognized, once its dramatic power felt, the theme in embryo is a distinct motive force in the future development of the play as it gradually shapes itself into form.

"Above all, the theme must be one that is dramatic and will lend itself readily to dramatic handling. In the first place, it must be able to be emphasized in such way that it will appeal to the assembled group; it must provoke their attention and emotional response. It must appeal to those large and basic motives in human life. Hervieu's 'Modesty' appeals because it emphasizes the fact that however much a woman may think that she wishes to be dealt with frankly and bluntly, innately she is susceptible to appeals to her vanity and flattery. Lady Gregory's 'Hyacinth Halvey' appeals to the observations of human kind that a good reputation, quite as much as a bad one, cannot easily be lived down. In the second place, the theme must be able to be developed through a plot into a significant and final dramatic situation."

It is apparent that what Mr. Lewis considers a theme is, as a matter of fact, the orientation of an idea. Mr. Lewis refers to Lady Gregory's "Hyacinth Halvey," which is orientated from the idea that a good reputa-

tion, quite as much as a bad one, cannot easily be lived down. This idea may be stated, from the standpoint of orientation, in various ways, as follows: Hyacinth Halvey was a devil in sheep's clothing, his clothing being letters of recommendation; or, a good name is better than great riches; or, a good character may or may not be a burden; or, testimonials are often deceptive. Be that as it may, the theme of "Hyacinth Halvey" is wickedness. Hyacinth Halvey personified wickedness, masked in the crucible of the play—testimonials of character.

In "Lady Windemere's Fan" the orientation of the play is from the idea that a blackmailing mother is capable of great sacrifice under certain circumstances for an innocent child.

"The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" is orientated from the idea "the ghosts of one's past life return—the skeletons rattle."

In "Michael and His Lost Angel" the orientation is from the idea that nothing is either good or bad, but thinking makes it so.

"Strife" is orientated from the idea that strife is waste; life is made up of compromises.

"The Madras House" is orientated from the idea of the morality or immorality of women.

In "The Hour-Glass" the orientation is from the idea that faith, not wisdom, is God's kingdom.

In "The Truth" the orientation is from the idea that true love is capable of great sacrifice and forgiveness.

"The Great Divide" is orientated from the idea that a caveman may make a woman happy.

"The Witching Hour" is orientated from the idea of telepathy.

"The Scarecrow" is orientated from the idea that witchcraft and all kindred ideas are illusion—tragedy when quickened—ludicrous when dead.

"The Weavers" is orientated from the idea of dividing the loaves and fishes.

"The Vale of Content" is orientated from the idea that a longing woman's equilibrium may be disturbed in the vale of content.

"The Red Robe" is orientated from the idea that the torture of the law causes the innocent to suffer.

"Know Thyself" is orientated from the idea that a woman may, by introspection and analysis, as well as will power, know herself and hold to duty.

"Pelleas and Melisande" is orientated from the idea of fantastic love.

"Beyond Human Power" is orientated from the idea of the pastor's intention—the quick or the dead.

"The Father" is orientated from the idea that a horned husband becomes a madman.

"The Cherry Orchard" is orientated from the idea that improvidence is ruin.

The orientation of "A Doll's House" is—"A woman's illusion (love) is destroyed by a man's unyielding logic."

The orientation of "Ghosts" is—"The sins of the father are visited upon the children," etc.

The orientation of "The Wild Duck" is—"It is a wise father who knows his own child."

The orientation of "The League of Youth" is—"A braying jackass is soon found out."

The orientation of "Rosmersholm" is—"Superstition (white horses) causes many suicides."

The orientation of "The Master Builder" is—"Feminine castles in the air are dangerous.

The orientation of "Pillars of Society" is—"A loyal wife may save a deceitful husband."

The orientation of "Hedda Gabler" is—"A woman without love or purpose becomes desperate."

The orientation of "The Fugitive" is—"Marriage without love is death."

The orientation of "Justice" is—"The wages of sin is death."

The orientation of "The Pigeon" is —"Is it charity to throw pearls before swine?"

The orientation of "The Mob" is—"Courage is death when fighting the mob."

The orientation of "Widowers' Houses" is—"A slum landlord finds a hypocritical son-in-law for an erratic, tempestuous daughter."

The orientation of "The Philanderer" is—"Philandering loses a good wife."

The orientation of "Mrs. Warren's Profession" is—

"An immoral mother (a harlot) may have a moral daughter."

The orientation of "Arms and the Man" is—"Master, servant, men and women all burlesque."

The orientation of "Candida" is—"A good wife mothers a strong man."

CHAPTER XVIII

DIALOGUE—ARTICULATED BY WORDS

The eighth element in the organic structure of a play is *dialogue*. Articulation means: "The act of speaking distinctly; the state of being; to speak as a human being; to unite or form an articulation."

The playwright should not undertake dialogue until the basic or organic structure of the play is thoroughly and convincingly set. It should never be thought of until the balance of the organic structure is definite and complete. There is no more relatively important element in the play than the dialogue; nevertheless, few playwrights really understand the purpose and office of dialogue. The function of dialogue may, in a certain concept, be conceived as the vision of a painter. A painter may have a most wonderful painting in his mind; nevertheless, until he becomes sufficiently proficient in execution as to be able to put upon the canvas and convey the picture which he has in his mind, it is love's labor lost. Dialogue serves, in a large measure, the purpose of conveying from playwright to audience the picture which exists in the playwright's mind. To this end it is of the greatest importance that every word in the play should be chosen with fine discrimination and exactness in respect to its meaning. The manu-

script should not contain an idle or a worthless word. Accuracy of thought and expression is the essence of scientific playwriting. In playwriting, as well as in every other phase of life, loose thought and loose expression are cardinal sins. The words used in the dialogue should be simple, plain and readily understood by an audience of average intelligence, unless a particular character must, of necessity, use complicated language in order to personify or characterize the particular emotion which such character visualizes in the play. Each and every word or sentence appearing in the dialogue should be so fashioned or framed, in respect to exact phraseology, that it correctly represents the strata of society in which the individual character whose emotion is being personified speaks, moves and has his being. Every sentence should be carefully formulated so as to convey the precise thought which the playwright intends, and should have direct and proximate relation to the basic and constituent elements of the play. In truth and in fact, no word or sentence should be inserted in the dialogue which does not, either directly or indirectly, refer to the basic emotion or the personification thereof, or which motivates the crucible, conflict, complication and/or intrigue to ultimate crisis and climax, or which does not progress the play by narrative, plot or story, or which does not create, describe, place or visualize one or more compartmented derivative situations, or which does not make plain and readily understood some phase or feature of Incidental

Detailed Construction, or which does not aid, directly or indirectly, in orientating the play through its various elements, or which does not tend to create the artistic image which places firmly and clearly in the mind and thought of the audience the picture which is visaged in the mind and heart of the playwright.

It is the writer's contention that the greatest value of the Algebraic Formula consists in the certainty with which each word and sentence in the dialogue may be algebraically keyed to one or more of the basic constituent elements of the organic structure; if this cannot be done, the word or sentence should be eliminated. No sentence should be contained in the play which does not, either directly or indirectly, relate to some one of the basic elements of the organic structure. The most fascinating feature of playwriting is developed when each and every word or sentence may be directly keyed to the Algebraic Formula.

Dialogue has been variously considered and treated by different authors. It may not be amiss to weigh and consider, in more or less detail, some of the commentaries upon dialogue. It is the writer's view that words in the dialogue should be used only to push the character along in the story. It is this pushing process which creates the progressive action of the play, and it is the most difficult thing for the novice to acquire. Dialogue which does not push or propel the movement of the play becomes static, argumentative and unemotional. It is the driving, travelling element

which holds the attention of the audience. No author in writing upon this subject has made the point more plain than Gordon Craig in "On the Art of the Theatre." Mr. Craig states at page 152 a proposition that is known to but few writers, that is, that Shakespeare seldom used direction in the original manuscripts of his plays. Mr. Craig says it is the late editions of Shakespeare that contain directions. No more important fact in the history of dramatic literature is available to demonstrate the real technique of dialogue. Mr. Craig says, at page 149: "Whatever picture the dramatist may wish us to know of, he will describe his scene during the progress of the conversation between the characters."

The sum and substance of Mr. Craig's commentary is this—the words of the dialogue must be such as will enable the stage director to take the dialogue and, without any directorial notes, be able to interpret not only the organic structure of the play and each and every part thereof, but interpret the soul and spirit of the play. Further than that the learning of Mr. Craig is, in sum, that the dialogue, word by word, should unfold, develop and push the action of the play. Whenever the pushing processes of the dialogue lag or come to an end, the play ceases to be dramatic and becomes didactic. All of these propositions are easy to lay down and state, nevertheless, it is difficult when writing dialogue to adhere to these directions. Therefore, we maintain that

the Algebraic Formula, setting forth scientifically each and every element of organic structure, will prove useful to the playwright, inasmuch as this organic structure will require that it be given shape and form before the playwright undertakes the dialogue. Every other element of the organic structure should be determined and set down by metes and bounds before undertaking to write dialogue. Mr. Price says ("The Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principles," page 354): "We do not begin a structure until all the materials are at hand."

Again at page 355 he says: "When we reach the Dialogue we are not writing Dialogue in order to construct the play, for that part of the work has been done."

At page 356 he says: "We . . . dialoguing a scene. We are carrying out by means of words the object of that scene, as it affects and effects Plot."

We are of the opinion that if the organic structure is first laid out, and if each character, basic or secondary, is given the proper emotion to personify, if the emotions selected are those which will truly carry through the motivation of the five C's (crucible, conflict, complication, crisis and climax), the dialogue which is articulated by words will be free of irrelevant matter and of necessity concrete, specific and limited to words which will cause the play to travel from compartmentation to compartmentation.

Mr. Baker says ("Dramatic Technique," page 339): "Emotion if given free way, finds the right words by which to express itself."

Again, at page 344: "When a dramatist works as he should, the emotion of his characters gives him the right words for carrying their feelings to the audience, and every word counts."

The error and mistake that is made by most playwrights in writing dialogue is the failure to realize that every character must have a specific and limited emotion; that drama is concentrated thought and action, and that permitting any character in a play to wobble emotionally is to disintegrate the character and make the character a nondescript. Furthermore, failure to identify the emotion of the character leads to misconception in interpretation and this misconception of interpretation may exist in so noted a critic and dramatist as Mr. Baker. At pages 347–350 Mr. Baker cites illustratively from "A Doll's House." It is apparent that Mr. Baker's conception of the basic emotion of Torvald and Nora respectively is incorrect. Torvald's selfishness, referred to by Mr. Baker ("Dramatic Technique," page 347), was really not selfishness. The psychology and the psychoanalysis of Torvald grow out of his integrity. Torvald personifies integrity; his integrity is of a character so narrow and inelastic, so arbitrary and without worldly understanding, that in the crisis he destroys the sublime love that Nora had for him. The psychology and the psychoanalysis of Nora

is that of imprudence. Nora was not a woman of the world; her life was a limited one; she knew nothing of law or the theory of law, and had no understanding of what civilization is pleased to call equity or justice. It was sufficient for her woman's heart (her husband being ill) that she secure the funds to permit of the trip to Italy. She did not conceive that she was doing anything wrong. It was the basic emotion imprudence, which constituted the very depth of her being, that put her in emotional conflict with the narrow integrity of her husband. When Ibsen changed Helmer's speech, whereas the original copy read—

> HELMER: Nora!—Oh, I must read it again. Yes, yes, it is so. You are saved, Nora, you are saved.

so that in the final acting edition it reads:

> HELMER: Nora!—Oh, I must read it again. Yes, yes, it is so. I am saved! I am saved! Nora, I am saved!

it did not necessarily mean, and does not mean, that Helmer was thinking only of himself. In this dialogue his narrow integrity knew that disclosure on the part of Krogstad of the forged note would inevitably cause a reflection on Helmer, as well as Nora. Nora anticipated that Helmer would take the blame. The logic of the situation and the psychology of the situation was, that even if Helmer did not take the blame, the exposure would necessarily have injured him because friends

of the family would question, in spite of everything, Helmer's integrity. This emphasizes the necessity of having the dialogue take into account the psychology of the character speaking under the particular circumstance or situation. There is a great deal of misconception in the public mind as to just what Ibsen intended the public to infer from the characters of Torvald and Nora. If the two characters be considered solely from the point of view of the basic emotions that each of them respectively personified, the plot is a reasonable and a probable one. Nora was a wonderful character, capable of intense love and sacrifice; she had many admirable qualities and, in so far as the play shows, but one unfortunate quality, that is, born of her basic emotion imprudence. Functioning as Nora did, reasoning as a woman of her type would reason, acting solely upon the conflict of her soul, having her illusion destroyed, she did the only thing that a woman of her type could have done—abandon Torvald and slam the door.

Mr. Baker evidences ("Dramatic Technique," page 397) the difficulty or problem confronting the playwright in writing dialogue. He says: "Picking just the right words to convey with gesture, voice and the other stage aids of dialogue the emotions of the characters is so exacting a task that many a writer tries to dodge it."

Again, at page 407, he truly says: "Dialogue is, naturally, still better if it possesses charm, grace, wit, irony, or beauty of its own."

This grace, wit, irony or beauty, must, however, in every instance be interpretive of the basic emotion or a related subsidiary emotion of the character speaking.

Mr. Archer says ("Play-Making," page 387): ". . . no play of which the dialogue places a constant strain on the intellectual muscles of the audience ever has held, or ever will hold, a place in living dramatic literature."

Mr. Archer ("Play-Making") quotes from Mrs. Craigie and says, at page 389: "She found in 'emotion' the test of dramatic quality in any given utterance. 'Stage dialogue,' she says, 'may or may not have many qualities, but it must be emotional.' "

Mr. Archer further says: "What Mrs. Craigie meant, I take it, was that, to be really dramatic, every speech must have some bearing, direct or indirect, prospective, present, or retrospective, upon individual human destinies."

Mr. Archer's statement will bear re-phrasing.—What Mrs. Craigie really meant was—that to be really dramatic every speech must have some direct or indirect relation to some one of the constituent elements of the organic structure of the play. Mr. Archer truly says ("Play-Making," page 400): ". . . the glorious problem of the modern playwright is to make his characters reveal the inmost workings of their souls without saying or doing anything that they would not say or do in the real world."

A character cannot reveal the inmost workings of his

soul unless what the character does say is psychologically in direct or indirect relation to the character's basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion.

Mr. Wilde says ("The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play," page 300): "Action is the power that causes the play to move. Dialogue is the balance wheel that makes the motion rapid or slow."

We think dialogue is power—much or little power. Long speeches have little dramatic power. Short, crisp dialogue, keyed algebraically to the organic structure, has dramatic power.

Again Mr. Wilde says: "Emotion and not cerebration directs the speech in which tumultuous feelings reveal themselves."

At page 323 he says: "Good dialogue is the servant of thought: . . ."

We think it also may be said that good dialogue is apt and terse expression of the psychology of the various characters in the emotional conflict.

Mr. Wilde says, at page 334: "The drama, at bottom, is a thing of emotion. Whatever the dialogue, emotional cast of one kind or another colors it. The emotion may be that of the speaker, or it may be that of the play, but in either event it elicits response from the audience. The emotion of the speaker, whatever it is, helps to characterize. The emotion of the play, whatever it is, helps to create atmosphere.

"One quarter of dialogue might be called expression of facts colored by emotion; three quarters of it might

be called expression of emotion colored by facts."

Again, at page 335 he says: "If the sole reason for dialogue is the will of the dramatist, emotion can hardly have much to do with it. But if the verbal garment of the play is natural it will be so intimately bound up with the emotions of the characters that it will characterize."

Again, at page 336: ". . . dialogue is . . . not argument; not debate; not mere controversy in which the decision must be a foregone conclusion from the start. Argument asks an audience to be impartial; the play demands quite the opposite. Argument, by its very nature, appeals to bloodless intellect; the play addresses itself to warm, palpitant, human emotions."

Charlton Andrews says ("The Technique of Playwriting," page 174): ". . . the best dramatic dialogue . . . is . . . not merely denotative but also connotative—that which implies and suggests a freightage of emotional significance it could not possibly carry in actual expression."

✓It is the judgment of the writer that dialogue should state enough to enable the auditor to awaken his experiences—tally up—check against his own life contacts. This is truly psychic echo.✓

Prof. B. Roland Lewis says ("The Technique of the One-Act Play," page 225): ". . . dramatic dialogue is a highly important and thoroughly organic part of a play. It is a constructive element quite as much as are plot and character."

Again, at page 232: ". . . dialogue, and herein lies its greatest function and highest possibilities, is used to reveal character and to express the ideas and feelings of the *dramatis personæ* at their moments of highest emotional functioning."

Again, at page 235: "The most essential characteristic of dramatic dialogue is its emotional spontaneity."

Again, at page 238: "In every-day life, lawless as is the sequence of its general activities, speech is not constructed to a given definite end. On the other hand, in a play, this is precisely what must be done; every bit of material and every bit of phrasing must be constructed with a view to a definite result."

At page 239: "Emotional values, rather than turns to style, are what count in speech as heard in the theatre."

At page 240: "Speech must fit personality and emotional functioning; just as characters differ, so must their dialogue differ."

Clayton Hamilton says ("Studies in Stagecraft," page 128): "This is an age . . . of emotion evidenced in action. . . ."

In the writing of dialogue it is of vital importance that at an early stage of the manuscript the playwright clearly register the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, personified in the basic character which permeates the play. In many of the plays selected by Mr. Baker to illustrate his point of clearness

much confusion would have been avoided if he had had access to or used the Algebraic Formula—for example: Mr. Baker quotes at great length the selective processes by which Mr. Edgar Selwyn got the story of "The Country Boy." If one will take Mr. Selwyn's article and reduce it to the Algebraic Formula, much of the confusion or difficulty which confronted Mr. Selwyn will be understood. "The Country Boy," as finally characterized by Mr. Selwyn, was orientated from the basic emotion *egotism*. He said that he had to have this chap a bumptious, conceited sort of youth when he met the hard knocks which were to come to him in the city. The city was the boy's crucible. It is the city in which the play is ground. The boy's egotism was motivated through crucible, conflict, complication and/or intrigue to ultimate crisis and climax. When Mr. Selwyn outlined the best story for his purpose, in the mingling of the boy and the old friend, he was compiling the narrative, plot or story. The character of the old man became a secondary character. As a secondary character the old man was a foil to the egotism of the youth. The experience given by the old man to the boy was compartmentation—derivative situations, woven together by the plot, which ultimately took the play to its successful end.

For a clear understanding of the confusion which confronted Mr. Baker in his work "Dramatic Technique," we shall take up the play entitled "Storm," by Ostrovsky, page 86. This play is orientated (Ele-

ment G) from the placing in the hands of Catherine the key to the gate in a garden hedge; this key becomes the point of orientation. Varvara has taken this key without the knowledge of her mother, who is the mother-in-law of Catherine. Varvara is a secondary character (Element F) who sends Boris, a secondary character (Element F) to the gate. The basic emotion of Catherine is fear and Catherine is the personification of the basic emotion fear. This may be perfectly demonstrated by algebraically keying the dialogue of Catherine as set forth in Mr. Baker's book at pages 86 and 87. This we will now undertake to do, as follows:

> Catherine.
> (Algebraic element B)
>
> [*Alone, the key in her hand.*]
> (Algebraic element F)
>
> Oh, what is she doing?
> *What hasn't she courage for?*
> Ah, she is crazy—yes, crazy.

These words refer to Varvara (Element F), a secondary character.

These words also refer to progressing the narrative (Element D).

> Here is what will ruin me. That's the truth! I must throw this key away, throw it far away, into the river, so that it may never be found again. It burns my hand like a hot coal.

The words "Here is what will ruin me" visualize the basic emotion fear (Element A). These words also visualize narrative, plot or story (Element D). These words also visualize a compartmented situation, in that they bring before the mind of the audience a picture of what may be characterized in and of itself as a "playlet"—a thing that has a beginning, a middle and an end. It may be found that the words "That's the truth" have no proper place in this dialogue and, from a scientific standpoint, should not be in the dialogue as they merely iterate the preceding assertion. The words "I must throw this key away, throw it far away, into the river, so that it may never be found again. It burns my hand like a hot coal" visualize—First: The orientation of the scene, in that the key, a stage prop (Element F), which Varvara puts into the hands of Catherine, is the thing which leads to a crisis; Second: The words also visualize the fear of Catherine (Element A), and narrative, plot or story, as well as a very dramatic compartmented situation (Element E).

The dialogue proceeds:

> This is how we are ruined, people like me! Slavery, that isn't a gay business for any one. How many ideas it puts into our heads. Another would be enchanted with what has happened to me, and would rush on full tilt.

The words "This is how we are ruined, people like me" properly visualize the elements in the scene nat-

urally resulting from the possession of the key and the thing which will eventuate from the possession of the key. However, the words "Slavery, that isn't a gay business for anyone" are not well chosen and, as per Algebraic Formula, should not have been used. A rendezvous between Catherine and her lover, Boris, would not be slavery; it would be disloyalty to her husband and might cause her much misery, but not slavery. A playwright being under obligation to use only words which effectively visualize and interpret the basic emotion and elements of the play, may not insert in the dialogue irrelevant words or sentences, or words or sentences which lead the mind of the audience into foreign pastures.

The dialogue proceeds:

> How can one act in that way without reflection, without reason? Misfortune comes so quickly, and afterward there is all the rest of one's life in which to weep and torment oneself, and the slavery will be still more bitter. [*Silence*] And how bitter it is, slavery! Oh, how bitter it is! Who would not suffer from it? And we other women suffer more than all the rest.

These words spoken by Catherine, referring to slavery, are not well chosen. The fact that a woman betrays or is disloyal mentally or physically to her husband does not enslave her. It may cause torment. It may cause misfortune. It would not cause slavery unless the disloyal wife became the slave of her so-called lover. If the words suggesting slavery had been

eliminated the dialogue would be stronger. It presents the basic element fear; the basic element B (personification of character); the basic element C (motivating the crucible which Catherine was going through mentally in taking inventory of what might come of her as a result of indiscretion); the basic element D (narrative or plot); and the basic element E (compartmentation).

Following on the dialogue reads:

> Here am I at this moment battling with myself in vain, not seeing a ray of light, and I shan't see one. The further I go, the worse it is. And here is this additional sin that I am going to take on my conscience.

These words constitute excellent dialogue, in that they visualize basic element A (emotion); element B (personification of character); element C (crucible, introspection); element D (narrative); element E (compartmentation). The words are concentrated and powerful.

Then follow the words:

> Were not my mother-in-law—she has broken me: it is she who has made me come to hate this house. I hate its very walls.

These words are not relevant or germane. These words might have been made relevant or germane if the playwright had indicated in what way the mother-in-law had broken Catherine so that Catherine had

come to "hate this house"; these words should have been amplified or eliminated.

Following on Catherine says:

> [*She looks pensively at the key.*] Ought I throw it away? Of course I ought. How did it get into my hands? To seduce me to my ruin. [*Listening.*] Some one is coming! My heart fails me. [*She puts the key into her pocket.*] No!—no one. Why was I so frightened? And I hid the key— Very well, that's the way it is to be.

These words constitute scientific dialogue, representing the basic emotion fear (Element A); personification of character (Element B); crucible or conflict (Element C), consisting of introspection and self-examination; narrative or plot (Element D), in that it suggests pre-existing and succeeding activity, mental and physical; compartmented situations (Element E). These words are clear, expressive dialogue.

Following on Catherine says:

> It is clear that Fate wills it. And after all, where is the sin in seeing him just once, if at a distance? And if I were even to talk with him a little, where would the harm be?—But my husband— Very well, it was he himself who didn't forbid it! Perhaps I shall never have such another chance in all my life. Then I shall weep and say to myself, "You had a chance to see him and didn't know how to take advantage of it." What am I saying? Why lie to myself? I will die for it if necessary, but see him I will. Whom do I want to

deceive here? Throw away the key? No, not for anything in the world. I keep it. Come what will, I will see Boris. Ah, if the night would only come more quickly!

These words constitute scientific dialogue, in that practically each sentence visualizes the different elements in the Algebraic equation. Each sentence can be keyed and, when so keyed, have direct relation to the basic theme (fear) and the orientation. No better illustration of the value of the Algebraic Formula in scientific playwriting may be had.

The foregoing analysis ought to be sufficient to visualize to any craftsman the method or system of constructing dialogue. In the first instance, dialogue should not be written until the craftsman has charted his play. The playwright must have a firm concept in his mind of the thing which he wants to do and is going to do before he undertakes to execute it. One may only have a firm concept of the thing which he intends to do if he (first) mentally visualizes and (secondly) places his vision on paper, that is to say, the structure that he intends to build.

There seems to have been ere this no formula available clearly indicating to the craftsman the constituent and necessary elements of a play. Playwrights have constantly builded from a sub-conscious or instinctive mind. The scientific Algebraic Formula does, clearly and definitely, guide the craftsman.

In the play "Abie's Irish Rose" there is a most re-

markable unity of thought and expression which necessarily has found an emotional reaction in probably the greatest theatrical audience that has ever been accorded to dramatic effort. In the play "Abie's Irish Rose" the basic theme or emotion, love, is compassed in the author's vision or consciousness as dramaturgically expressed in—

1. Solomon's love for his child;
2. Solomon's love for his race;
3. Solomon's love for his religion;
4. Solomon's love for the memory of his deceased wife, whose life was destroyed in the travail of childbirth;
5. Solomon's love for progeny;
6. The love between the boy and the girl;
7. The love of the boy and the girl for their respective fathers;
8. The love of the Priest and Rabbi for humanity;
9. The love of friends.

These nine elements of love, concentrated in a single play, present perhaps the most extraordinary illustration of the development of a basic or causative theme. It is inconceivable that any audience may be gathered in which each and every member thereof may not react emotionally to one or more of these basic elemental phases of love. The dialogue invented by the craftsman articulating these various elements of love is scientific in most instances, intense and dramatic. It is this, in the opinion of the writer, which may be said

to account for the tremendous success of this play. Note the following dialogue:

COHEN: Poor Solomon! He's worried about Abie.

SOLOMON: Ha, ha, peoples, my Abie's god a girl! Maybe the good Rabbi will soon officiate at a wedding, eh?

COHEN: Is she Hebrew?

SOLOMON: Of course, Hebrew. Jewish Hebrew. [*He is delighted. He nudges* COHEN.] Abie says vait till I see her? [*Turns to* RABBI]: Dr. Samuels—"Lieber Freund." Maybe ve'll all be goin' to a vedding soon, yes! No, it isn't the idea that I want my Abie married exactly, but I want his grandchildren. You see before my Abie was born, Rebecca and I we always used to plan for him. . . . Did you ever see any of Abie's girls?

RABBI: No.

SOLOMON: Not one Jewish and my Abie is certainly not going to marry anyone but a Jewish girl if I can help it. Good bye, peoples, good bye, and don't forget. When my Abie says a thing you can build a bank on it. Abele, Boyele meiner.

ROSE MARY: Wouldn't it be wonderful if our fathers would take our marriage nicely!

ABIE: [*hugging her closer*]: Wonderful! Now, you stop worrying about that dear. I'm sure father will fall in love with you as I did, on first sight. [*With a winning smile*]: Dad—

SOLOMON: [*holds* ABIE *off, and looks at him fondly, then he hugs him to him*]: Abie——

[ROSE MARY *enters laughing,* SOLOMON *sees* ROSE MARY. . . .

SOLOMON: Oh! You brought somethink in vid you yes? Ven my son goes vid a girl, dot girl must speak the English language like a Jewess.

ROSE MARY: Oh, yes. We met in France! Your son was a wonderful hero, Mr. Levy, do you realize that?

SOLOMON: Ain'd he my son! How could he be anything else?

ABIE: Listen! You love me, don't you?

ROSE MARY: Oh, Abie darling, that's the trouble. I do love you.

SOLOMON: [*nudges* ROSE MARY]: I hate to tell you Miss Murpheski, never before has Abie had such a nice little Jewish girl. That's right. Keep it up! I like to hear you call him Abie! He's a wonderful boy, my Abie.

ROSE MARY: Indeed he is!

SOLOMON: You like him?

ROSE MARY: Very much. He's a splendid man.

SOLOMON: You don't know the half of it. All by myself I raised him.

ROSE MARY: Yes, Abie told me his mother died when he was born. [SOLOMON *nods his head "yes."*] My mother died when I was born too.

SOLOMON: [*turning to her*]: Your father raised you too?

ROSE MARY: [*nods her head*]: My father is a wonderful man.

ABIE: You like her, dad?

SOLOMON: She's a nice girl; Jewish and everything. She's a vonderful girl. Didn't I told you to vait before ven you brought all those girls around, those Christian girls? Didn't I say Abie, vait—you'll meet

a nize little Jewish girl some day. Didn't I say that?

ABIE: You did, Dad!

SOLOMON [*very expressively*]: Oi! You should see Abie's Rosie! Such a hair! Such a teeth! Such a figure! . . . They should have been married with the childrens py this time. Issac, I love dod girl! She's a vine vife for Abie. Und dod loafer he von't esk her yet. . . . Nod marry my Abie! Vhere do you get that stuff? Who could refuse my Abie? Ain'd he my son?

ABIE: Do you want Rosie for a daughter-in-law?

SOLOMON: Do I want a million dollars?

ABIE: All right, I'll ask her. [*Starts to walk away, then turns to his father*]: But are you quite sure you like her?

SOLOMON: [*smiling at* COHEN *blandly*]: Ain'd dod a son to have?

COHEN: Vell, Solomon, you have been hard to blease! I'll say dod for you. Abie has prought at least a dozen girls I've seen my own eyes with.

SOLOMON: Tut, tut. But dey vere not Jewish.

ABIE: Well, I want you both to know that I'm not marrying Rosie because she's Jewish . . .

SOLOMON: But I vould care! You know, Rosie, ve vere talking aboud you vile you vas gone. Ve vere saying vot a lucky man he vould be, who god you.

ROSE MARY: Oh, Mr. Levy, your blarney is wonderful!

SOLOMON: Please don'd say dod void to me. I never allow it to be used in my house. There! Vot did I told you? You know Rosie—[*Thinking he has won the argument*]: Ven you marry, you get a nize little Jewish boy vhat keeps his Yom Kippur.

ROSE MARY: Oh. Abie, he's really a dear.

ABIE: Of course he is, and so are you.

ROSE MARY: . . . Oh, dear! Abie, it's been an awful week.

ABIE. I know it dear! [*Holding her in his arms*]: But it will soon be over.

ROSE MARY: If my father arrives before the Rabbi marries us, both your father and my father will prevent it. Then please God he doesn't find out I'm not a little Jewish girl until the good Rabbi ties the knot.

ABIE: Now don't worry, dear, everything is going to be all right.

ABIE: In fifteen minutes you will be married to me for the second time.

ROSE MARY [*fervently*]: I hope so!

SOLOMON [*holding out his arms*]: How sveet you look! Oi! Such a bride! Abie, look at her. Look at her. Und den tank me!

ABIE: Father, please don't borrow trouble! I'm nervous enough.

SOLOMON: You're nervous! Vot do you tink I am? But I shall nod rest until I see you two lovers unided for life.

ROSE MARY: Abie and I are never going to be divided, are we Abie?

ABIE: Oh, I'll say we're not.

SOLOMON: Never did I see such love! Ain'd she a bride? [*Very proudly*]

ABIE [*who, since* ROSE MARY *has left the room has paid no attention to the conversation, smiles at the* RABBI]: Thanks! [RABBI *exits door*]. [SOLOMON *has been looking at* ABIE *affectionately, he goes up to him, puts his arm around him.*]

SOLOMON: My little Abie! Sure it seems like only yesterday, I vos waiting for your Mama, just like you are vaiting for Rosie now. My son, I hope you can keep Rosie by your side until your hair is white like mine! ! ! My Rebecca didn't stay so long wid me, only a little while . . . bud no one couldn't take her place. I think you lofe Rosie the same way.

ABIE: I do, Dad! I love Rosie better than my life.

SOLOMON: Dod's the vay, Abie! Und I lofe Rosie too!

ABIE: I'm so glad of that, Dad! Will you always love her?

SOLOMON: Sure, why nod? Ain't she Jewish and everything!

VOICE IN THE HALL: Come on in, Father! This must be the house.

[PATRICK MURPHY, ROSE MARY'S *father, enters the room, followed by* FATHER WHALEN. PATRICK *is a big, burly Irishman. Red-faced, brawny. The kind who fights at the drop of a hat, but if appealed to in the right way, would give his last dollar.*]

[FATHER WHALEN, *the priest, is a good-looking man of the scholarly type. Gentle, and kind. Irish, but of the esthetic type.*]

FATHER WHALEN: Patrick, we shouldn't enter a man's house without an invitation.

PATRICK: This is the house all right. Didn't the children outside the door say the wedding was to be here.

FATHER WHALEN: Patrick! You know love has never been a respector of religion!

PATRICK: Who said anything about love! I'm talk-

ing about them oranges! I hate orange! 'Tis the color of the damned A.P.A.'s.

SOLOMON [*enters*]: Is your name Murpheski?

PATRICK: What?

SOLOMON: Are you Solomon Murpheski?

PATRICK [*looking at* FATHER WHALEN *then back to* SOLOMON]: Say, are you trying to kid me?

SOLOMON: No. I'm expecting Solomon Murpheski.

PATRICK: My name is Patrick Joseph Murphy.

SOLOMON: Gewald!

PATRICK: Not Gewald—Murphy! And I'm looking for my daughter. Is she here?

SOLOMON: Nobody by dod name is here. Vod do you vant?

PATRICK: I'm looking for the home of Michael Magee!

FATHER WHALEN: Come Patrick, I told you we were in the wrong house.

PATRICK: I'm very sorry. But I'm looking for my daughter. She is to be married tonight to a young fellow by the name of Michael Magee! I thought this was the address she gave me.

FATHER WHALEN: Well, Patrick, if our Rose Mary has married this boy, we'll have to make the best of it.

COHEN: Sure! They are crazy about each other. Never did I see such love.

SOLOMON: They are both crazy!

[RABBI *goes to* PATRICK.]

RABBI: Are you Rosie's father?

PATRICK: Rosie's father?

SOLOMON: Oi! Oi!

RABBI: Why, Solomon, what is the matter, has something happened?

SOLOMON: [*Pointing to* PATRICK] Look at him! And ask me. I shall die from shame! His name's Murphy.

[FATHER WHALEN *and* RABBI *look at each other for a second, then they smile.*]

FATHER WHALEN: It looks like war between the Murphys and the Levys.

RABBI: Yes, I pity the young folks.

ROSE MARY: Oh, Father Whalen!

FATHER WHALEN: There, there, child!

ROSE MARY: Can't you do something with Father, he's gone mad!

FATHER WHALEN: Such a pretty bride, too! [*He looks around at the girls*]: Faith, dear, your bridesmaids look frightened to death.

ROSE MARY: They have reason to be, Father! You ought to hear Abie's father and my father fight! Oh! Such language! But your father said he'd sell me for a nickel!

ABIE [*Taking her in his arms*]: But you don't belong to my father, dear, you belong to me. And I wouldn't sell you for the whole world with a fence around it. [*A complication ensues as to whether* ROSE MARY *and* ABIE *are legally married. Finally* ABIE *says*: Well, I married Rose Mary Murphy just one week ago today in Jersey City. [*Takes her in his arms.*]

FATHER WHALEN: Patrick, as I told you before, you'd better make the best of it. The children have done all they could to satisfy both fathers.

RABBI: Father Whalen, I wouldn't suggest it, but so long as the young folks have made a business of getting married, I don't think it would do any harm to marry them again in her faith, do you?

FATHER WHALEN: I don't think so!

[*At the end of Act II. the boy and girl are married by* FATHER WHALEN.]

PATRICK: My God! They've done it again!

[*In Act III.* ROSE MARY *says*]:

ROSE MARY: You know, Abie, I can't understand. Our fathers loved us so much, yet they won't forgive us for marrying.

ABIE: Now, don't start to worry again about that. You are not strong enough yet. Aren't we happy?

ROSE MARY: Oh, Abie! [*Looking up into his face lovingly*]: But you worry too! . . .

ABIE: Oh, I know I do. But every time I do, I say to myself, "Well, old boy, you've got the dearest [*kiss*] sweetest, [*kiss*] wife in the world, so why worry?"

ROSE MARY: That's right, we have each other.

ABIE: Yes, I've been a proud father just a month today. Poor Dad! You know I think he is dying to see just what a son of his son's looks like.

[FATHER WHALEN *enters; inquires after the family.*]

FATHER WHALEN: Everything seems peaceful enough now.

ROSE MARY: Oh, Father Whalen, I can't believe my eyes. Is it really you? How's father? Have you seen him lately? Is he well? He won't even write to us. Did he send his love?

FATHER WHALEN: No dear, not by me. But I think he would have liked to.

ABIE: Don't you care dear! We should worry about your old father!

ROSE MARY: But I do care. He's my father!

FATHER WHALEN: Lead me to it! I'm crazy about babies!

[PATRICK *enters.*]

PATRICK: I wondered where you had gotten to.

FATHER WHALEN: They have Company!

PATRICK: . . . I saw a little store down the street, and thought I'd get a few things—for my granddaughter.

[*They discuss the sex of the baby.*]

PATRICK: That's the trouble. It isn't good enough for Rose Mary. Why she is a direct descendant of the Kings of Ireland!

FATHER WHALEN: Well, Abie might be a direct descendant of the Kings of Jerusalem?

[ABIE *enters.*]

ABIE: No! Just plain Jew. But I love Rose Mary, Mr. Murphy, more than you do.

PATRICK: Oh, you do, do you?

ABIE: Yes, for I wouldn't do anything in the world to cause her the tiniest bit of unhappiness. Can you say as much?

[RABBI *enters.*]

RABBI: You came all the way from California to spend your Christmas with Rosie?

PATRICK: I did not. I didn't come to see Rose Mary. 'Tis the child I came to see. If it looks Irish, it gets all my money.

[SOLOMON *enters.*]

SOLOMON: Listen to him, he thinks it's a girl!

PATRICK: Do you know what it is?

SOLOMON: No! But I know it isn't a girl!

[PATRICK *and* SOLOMON *quarrel about whether the*

baby is a boy or a girl; they also quarrel about their race and their religion.]

PATRICK: If she's a girl she gets all my money!

SOLOMON: If she's a boy, she gets all mine!

It develops that there are twins, a boy and a girl, and the Irish father and the Jewish father are reconciled.

CHAPTER XIX

IMAGED WITH ARTISTRY

✓ The ninth and final element of the Algebraic Formula comprehends and includes that which idealizes, personifies, visualizes or paints emotionally the picture of the play in such concrete form that an audience reacts to, and is thrilled by the basic emotion, or an element in or of a basic emotion, its expression or effect in relation to the subsidiary emotions reflected in the travel of the basic character, or one or more of the secondary characters.

Artistry may be imaged either in scene, action, language, or effects. Many writers have taken exception to the suggestion that a play may be written or constructed as per Algebraic Formula, the invariable criticism being that a play so constructed would be rigid, inelastic, stiff and inartistic. These critics lose sight of the fact that the organic structure of a play is one thing, its artistry another. If one is going to construct a house he will vision a very different organic structure than if he is going to build a bridge. Albeit, certain scientific principles are applicable either in the building of a house or a bridge. Form exists fundamentally in every structure—physical or mental.

To build a play organically and structurally correct,

to do the thing scientifically, does not preclude or interdict the decoration of the play with artistry, always commensurate with the craftsman's talent or capacity. The organic structure of a play places no limitation upon the craftsman's imagination; it does not in any way bind or limit his fantastic conceits; there need not be any qualification of the craftsman's power of invention—to the contrary—an understanding of organic structure encourages metaphysical and psychological analysis and the inevitable result must be, or should be, a play more artistic than one altogether subconsciously or instinctively conceived or executed.

Artistry in a play has relation not only to its imaginative appeal, its originality, its inventiveness, its emotional reaction, but, in a far greater degree, has relation to the soundness and the certitude of its metaphysical antecedent. A character must have artistic delineation, and this can only be secured through metaphysics—the searching out of the soul of a character. This is the secret of Ibsen's mastery. If one is writing a play in which the basic character is repression (a difficult emotion to express, nevertheless one that surges in the soul of millions of people)—the agony of repression,—the psychic echo of a character whose dominant emotion is repression,—there is a great theme for a play. There are more women living a life of agony through repression than as a result of any other single emotion.

If a play is not evolved in a metaphysical concept it

is cold and flat. Take for instance the play "The Farmer's Wife," where the basic emotion is desire on the part of the widower to marry again, the crucible of the play being wooing,—the author failed to give to the basic character a metaphysical background; therefore, the play, in a large measure, became dull and commonplace. In the play "The Farmer's Wife" we have a basic character who desires to marry—just why he desires to marry again, the play never discloses. Was his wife a good or bad woman? Was she loving? Did she influence his life in any degree? Was she an inspiration? What effect did she have upon the basic character's life? What chain of action or reaction or post-mortem impressions did she leave with the widower? Why did he desire a second wife? The play does not, either directly or indirectly, show the metaphysical basis for the emotion or desire in the causative character. Did the causative character, by virtue of his experience with his first wife, inherit this desire? The play does not tell. There is not a line in the play that causes the auditor to pull or root for the basic character; one is never interested in the basic character's desire; no one in the audience is particularly disturbed as to whether the basic character marries again or not; there is no emotional reaction or psychic echo on the part of the audience to the causative character, for he has no metaphysical background. This metaphysical background might have been given by an artistic craftsman; the relation between the cau-

sative character and his children might have created such a background; it might have been developed between Sweetland and Araminta Dench—something that would have given a spiritual urge on the part of the audience in behalf of the wife-hunting Sweetland. The author was carried away with characterization of incidental characters and personalities in a secondary action, which meant nothing to the play.

There can be true artistry only when there is unity of thought and expression in the development of the play. We cannot pick up a character willy-nilly and either love or hate him; the craftsman must show us something about the character; this something must necessarily be antecedent, which will cause us (the audience) to take arms for or against the character, and that, after all, is what creates the true dramatic spell of magic.

In "The Changing Drama," by Archibald Henderson, at page 39, he quotes Alfred Stevens, as follows: "'Art . . . is nature seen through the prism of an emotion.'"

"Prism" is defined to be a solid whose bases are similar, equal and parallel, and whose sides are parallelograms; an instrument of solid glass with triangular ends. This is mathematical and scientific. The shades and colorings, however, that are reflected from a prismatic glass are incapable of description.

Emotion is biological and eternal; it is never-changing, and its artistic reaction is always one of

relativity. One man's meat is another man's poison.

Archibald Henderson says ("The Changing Drama," page 157): "If the forces are more nearly equalized and the consequences clearly do not promise disaster, we have comedy, with its various shadings—(citing, among others, Wilde's Lady Windemere's Fan).

How can anyone view "Lady Windemere's Fan" as a comedy? Here is a play in which a woman, personifying innocence (Lady Windemere) is laboring under the impression that her mother was all that a mother ought to be. Lady Windemere idealized the memory of her mother. Mrs. Erlynne, her mother, comes to London; Lady Windemere, through the complication, is led to believe that Mrs. Erlynne is an amour of Lord Windemere; Lady Windemere never knows Mrs. Erlynne as her mother. May we imagine a more intense tragedy than a mother and daughter brought in contact, in conflict, in complication, in crisis—the daughter never knowing her mother and the mother suffering the agony of the result of her sin?

Again Mr. Henderson says, at page 279 ("The Changing Drama"): "The temper of modern art is atmospheric. . . . Not action, not character, is the primary consideration: the predominant issue is the creation of a certain mood, a unity of impression, or as Poe phrased it, a 'totality of effect.' In dramas, similar in tone to the short-story, there is no individual hero—since a hero implies at once overtopping dominance of either character or action, or both. The real

'hero' or predominant influence of the drama may be an impersonal, intangible force or emanation, casting over the whole scene the glamour of its influence or darkening the picture with the shadow of its sable wings."

The question here is—Can there be a unity of impression, a totality of effect, an impersonal, intangible force or emanation if the audience cannot understand? Is it possible to make an audience understand a play which lacks organic structure? In what way may an audience be made to understand what a play is about? Atmosphere—mood—color—never have, and never will, constitute drama.

Can there be a creation of a mood, a unity of impression, or a totality of effect without action and character? And how is action or character indicated except by a dominant emotion as a causative force creating unity of character? Examine Bernard Shaw's "You Never Can Tell"—the causative character (Valentine, the dentist), personifying adventure—the play is a difficult one to understand, for the characters are given so many varying and conflicting emotions, or elements in or of an emotion, that each character becomes a burlesque.—Valentine, the dentist, discloses emotionally remorse, conscientiousness, truth, frankness, love, inquisitiveness, dread, sympathy, fancifulness, imagination, feeling, chivalry, sentiment, romance, courage, fickleness. Can a man who is fickle be

truthful or frank? Can a fickle man be conscientious? Does a courageous man dread?

The second character, Gloria, has as her dominant emotion perhaps pride. Subsidiary emotions: Passion, haughtiness, impatience, impetuousness, dominance, obstinacy, fastidiousness, independence, insistence, dread, torment, tyranny, hate.

Gloria's mother, who is probably the next character in importance, has as her dominant emotion very likely secretiveness; she is kind, humane, placid, resolute, and sounds emphatically remonstrance.

Crampton has as his dominant emotion probably hardness. He is obstinate, ill-tempered, grasping, dogmatic, shrewd, resentful, courageous, bitter and hates.

Dolly, the sister, has as her basic emotion probably inquisitiveness. Subsidiary emotions: Insolence, impertinence, emphasis, tyranny, volubleness, spoiled, indiscreet, independent.

Dolly's brother has as his dominant emotion probably volubleness. Subsidiary emotions: Suave, prompt, independent.

The waiter William has as his dominant emotion probably tact. He is diplomatic, philosophical, kind, patient, considerate. His son, lawyer Bohun, has as his dominant emotion command. Subsidiary emotion: Counsel. He is proud, over-bearing, philosophical, sagacious.

There are a number of other emotions in each of these characters. This play "You Never Can Tell" is indicative of Shaw's burlesque drama—a drama of disintegrated characters, invariably loaded down with subsidiary emotions.

CHAPTER XX

LITERARY PIRACY AND COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

It is not intended in this chapter to deal with nor consider the subject of literary piracy and copyright infringement from a legal aspect, except in so far as the subject has relation to the literary organic structure of a play.

We have heretofore excerpted at length two cases involving the question of copyright infringement. These opinions were set forth for the purpose of indicating the difficulty confronting courts in determining when and where piracy and infringement existed. We now have to consider whether or not, under the Algebraic Formula, the question of piracy and infringement may more readily be uncovered.

What constitutes piracy or infringement as interpreted by the courts? In an unreported case (*Franklin v. Irwin*) Judge Hough used the expression "designed sequence of connected events." Let us reflect upon this expression: Designed how? From what? In what way? After what form or pattern? We say "causative chain of sequential events." A play so evolved as to present (see Judge Knox's opinion in *International Film S. Co. v. Affiliated Distributers,*

283 Fed. Rep. 231) setting, atmosphere, sequence of events, detail of narrative from an emotion constituting a basic theme, may be integrated and disintegrated consecutively.

The Algebraic Formula classifies the elements of a play in such a way as to admit of definitive processes of comparison. Dr. Brander Matthews, testifying in the case of *Simonton v. Gordon* (official minutes, pages 413–414) was asked:

Cross Question 432: Accepting the proposition from a literary standpoint that coincidents have nothing in particular to do with the subject of plagiarism, I ask you if it is not true that when you come to examine and analyze a play or a book to determine whether or not plagiarism exists, you must look to the organic structure of either the play or the book?

Answer: Yes, I suppose so.

Cross Question 433: I ask you if the inquiring mind can take two plays, or a play and a book, and if you can follow the organic structure from the original motivating cause down the line through the organic structure you have plagiarism, have you not?

Answer: Probably. I am not certain about that.

(By the Court) Question 434: What means would you adopt to determine whether or not a play had been taken from a novel?

Answer: I think my knowledge of the author of the play would be very important. I should want to know whether he was that kind of a person.

Cross Question 435: You don't know anything about the man's character?

Answer: *I really do not know what the tests are.* I should feel very much like the one in the Treasury who tells whether it is a counterfeit note. I have seen plays and things that look singularly alike and I am certain they were produced without one suggestion of the other.

The question is—Is playwriting, or, for that matter, novel writing, so elusive a thing that the question of piracy or infringement is dependent upon a personal equation? We think not.

The next question propounded to Dr. Matthews was:

Cross Question 436: Professor, let us see if we cannot develop that for the court. If there is a basic theme in a play and another basic theme in another play, you couldn't have the same play, could you?

Answer: No.

Cross Question 437: For instance, assuming for the purpose of my question (you will have to agree with me in the terms, but only for the purpose of the question)—assuming that the theme of "Othello" is jealousy and that the theme of "Hamlet" is melancholy, of course the craftsman could not write the same play?

Answer: Certainly not.

The reader will have had the advantage of reading the complete opinion of Judge Knox in *International Film S. Co. v. Affiliated Distributers,* 283 Fed. Rep. 231. Let us now compare, according to the Algebraic

Formula, the picture "I Am the Law" and "The Valley of Silent Men":—

(A) In "I Am the Law" and "The Valley of Silent Men" the basic emotion or theme is sacrifice.

(B) In "I am the Law" the basic emotion of sacrifice is personified in the causative character, Corporal Fitzgerald; in "The Valley of Silent Men" in the causative character, Sergeant Kent;

(C–1) *Crucible:* In "I Am the Law" and "The Valley of Silent Men" the crucible is identical, to wit, fate;

(C–2) *Conflict:* In "I Am the Law" and "The Valley of Silent Men" the elements of emotional conflict are as follows:

In "I Am the Law" Corporal Fitzgerald is the causative character and personifies sacrifice; in "The Valley of Silent Men" Sergeant Kent is the causative character and personifies sacrifice.

In "I Am the Law" the first secondary character is that of Joan, personifying love, paralleled in "The Valley of Silent Men" with Marette, who personifies love.

In "I Am the Law" the next secondary character in point of interest is the mother of the causative character; the mother is a character spoken of and does not appear in the picture; the mother, however, may be paralleled with

that of McTrigger in "The Valley of Silent Men"; McTrigger personifies friendship; Fitzgerald's sacrifice is made for his mother; Sergeant Kent's sacrifice is made for his friend McTrigger. At this point the direct parallel of elements of conflict end. We have, however, a partial parallel in the characters of Tom (Fitzgerald's brother) and the Chinaman (in "I Am the Law"), each personifying lust. These two characters have, in a measure, a counterpart in Kedsty, who personifies (in "The Valley of Silent Men") evil and wickedness. There are three additional characters in "I Am the Law," to wit, the Commandant, who personifies resentment, that is, he is resentful of Tom's affair with his wife; the Commandant's wife, who personifies disloyalty; and the Trapper, who personifies truth.

This is an accurate analysis of the elements of conflict in both "I Am the Law" and "The Valley of Silent Men" and indicates the identical parallels and where the line of demarcation begins and ends.

(C–3) *Complication:* There are certain elements of identical complication in "I Am the Law" and "The Valley of Silent Men" and certain marked differences; these may be noted as follows:

1. In "I Am the Law" Corporal Fitzgerald kills the Chinaman who is undertaking to injure Joan. This complication has no counterpart whatsoever in "The Valley of Silent Men";

2. Tom, the brother of Corporal Fitzgerald, kills the Commandant. This has a counterpart in "The Valley of Silent Men" only in so far as McTrigger is charged with the killing of Barkeley;

3. Corporal Fitzgerald becomes ill—he believes fatally so. This has an exact counterpart in "The Valley of Silent Men" in that Kent becomes ill—he believes fatally so;

4. Corporal Fitzgerald, believing that he is going to die, signs a confession wherein he takes upon himself the murder of the Commandant, thereby clearing his brother Tom. This sacrifice is made by Corporal Fitzgerald on account of his mother. This incident has a counterpart in "The Valley of Silent Men" in that Kent, believing himself ill unto death, undertakes to befriend McTrigger, who is charged with the killing of Barkeley. Kent takes upon himself the murder of Barkeley, thus sacrificing his good name in order to save his friend McTrigger;

5. Note that Corporal Fitzgerald's sacrifice was made for his mother, whereas Kent's sac-

rifice was made for his friend McTrigger;

6. In "I Am the Law" Corporal Fitzgerald lives, contrary to his expectations. This episode is identical in "The Valley of Silent Men" in that Kent lives, contrary to his expectation.

(C–4) *Crisis:*

1. In "I Am the Law" the Trapper reports that Corporal Fitzgerald is alive. This particular episode does not exist in "The Valley of Silent Men";

2. In "I Am the Law" Corporal Fitzgerald is arrested for the murder of the Commandant. This crisis has an exact counterpart in "The Valley of Silent Men" in that Kent is arrested for the murder of Barkeley. Each of these men is arrested for murder as the direct result of confessions made by each one—the result of the causative theme sacrifice;

3. In "I Am the Law" Corporal Fitzgerald is about to be lynched. The only counterpart to this in "The Valley of Silent Men" is that Kent is in jail and about to be tried for the murder;

4. In "I Am the Law" Joan, who has nursed Corporal Fitzgerald back to life, entreats the widow of the Commandant to tell the truth that Tom, and not the Corporal, killed her husband. The widow accedes to

Joan's prayer; the mob believes her; the Corporal is saved from lynching. There is no exact counterpart to this crisis in "The Valley of Silent Men," except in so far as Kent is rescued from the prison by Marette and in that Kent and Marette flee down the river. This, however, is not the exact crisis of "I Am the Law." Furthermore, in "The Valley of Silent Men" Kent and Marette become separated and believe each other lost, which has no counterpart in "I Am the Law."

(C–5) *Climax:* In "I Am the Law" Corporal Fitzgerald (sacrifice) marries Joan (love). In "The Valley of Silent Men" Kent (sacrifice) marries Marette (love).

POINTS OF PARALLEL AND DISSIMILARITY EMPHASIZED

As will be seen in this case, Judge Knox found infringement, notwithstanding there was (1) subtraction or elimination of characters; (2) elimination of certain elements of complication and crisis; (3) dramatic change of certain elements of complication and crisis. Nevertheless, the causative chain of sequential events were so similar as to indicate infringement.

The famous case of *Dam v. Kirk LaShelle* (C. C.) 166 Fed. 589, may be analyzed through the Algebraic Formula, as follows:

(A) The theme or basic emotion is courage;
(B) Causative character—Dan;
(C–1) *Crucible:* The crucible is becoming a father;
(C–2) *Conflict:* The conflict is between the wife, the mother-in-law and Dan;
(C–3) *Complication:* The complication that comes into the life of these three people is through the birth of the baby, which changes the disposition of Dan and calls into being his latent courage;
(C–4) *Crisis:* The crisis is the assertion by Dan of his paternal rights—he becomes rejuvenated;
(C–5) *Climax:* As a result of the preceding happenings, the father comes into his own.

In *Dam v. Kirk LaShelle*, Judge Hazel found infringement. Albeit, (1) the dialogue of the drama is not in the words of the copyrighted story; (2) the exact phraseology was not necessary to the adaptation of the plot; or (3) subject; or (4) portrayal of the different characters; (5) there is portrayal or imitation by the characters in the play of the characters in the copyrighted story; (6) use is made of incidents and situations which apparently give expression to the central theme or purpose of the author; (7) new matter is introduced into the play, but (8) it does not obscure or emasculate the central figure of the story—the rejuvenated husband; (9) the copyrighted story was not strictly a dramatic composition, although (10) its special features, (11) its incidents, (12) its personages

and (13) its episodes plainly indicated that it was not without dramatic interest and could, by appropriate dialogue, scenes and stage business, be translated or expanded into a drama; (14) introducing additional characters did not avoid the infringement.

In "Wedding Presents" the theme or basic emotion is disguise, personified in the causative character, Jack Barnes. The crucible is detective work. The emotional elements of conflict are: Jack Barnes disguised as a woman; Marie, crooked; Denison, service; Second-Story Smith, burglar; Frenchy, daring, and Frisco Kate, disguise; Commissioner Barnes, pursuit. The complication, crisis and climax is easily segregated in the opinion of Judge Manton.

"Cheating Cheaters" has an entirely different organic structure. The theme or basic emotion is deception, personified in the causative character Ruth Ferris, a young newspaper woman. The crucible of this play is "cheating cheaters." The conflict is between Ruth Ferris, the causative character (deception), Lazarre, a lawyer (conspiracy), the Brockton gang (thieves), Tom Palmer (heroism), the Palmer family (thieves). The complication, crisis and climax of "Cheating Cheaters" are easily traced in the opinion of Judge Manton.

Enough is here shown to demonstrate that, while these two plays ("Wedding Presents" and "Cheating Cheaters") have certain resemblances, the organic structure of each play is entirely different. The

orientation of "Wedding Presents" is the same as the crucible, detective work; whereas in "Cheating Cheaters" the orientation is likewise "cheating cheaters."

In the case of *Ida Vera Simonton v. Leon Gordon* it was claimed by the complainant that the play "White Cargo" was an infringement of complainant's book "Hell's Playground." The Algebraic Formula was used to demonstrate the infringement, the contention of the complainant being that the basic emotion or theme in book and play is *despair.*

In the book "Hell's Playground" the basic emotion of despair was personified in the causative character Huntington. In the play "White Cargo" the basic emotion *despair* is personified in the causative character, Langford. In the book and in the play the crucible is Africa.

ELEMENTS OF CONFLICT IN "HELL'S PLAYGROUND" AND "WHITE CARGO"

The causative character, Huntington in "Hell's Playground"—Langford in "White Cargo," each personify *despair.*

The leading secondary character, Ndio in "Hell's Playground"—Tondelyo in "White Cargo," each personify *lust.*

The conflict is *despair* in combat with *lust.* This was emotion pitted against emotion.

The next secondary character in point of importance

—in "Hell's Playground" is Moore—"White Cargo" Witzel. Moore and Witzel each personify jealousy, with subsidiary emotions practically parallel; some of these subsidiary emotions are—bitterness, sneering, passion, languor, envy, hatred, despair and prophesy.

In the book and in the play a secondary character is a doctor, who personifies kindness. It was contended at the trial, and is probably true, that the character of the doctor was taken from "The Poppy God." So far as the doctor is concerned, in "White Cargo" he is clearly an interpolated and unrelated character.

The next character in point of importance in the book and in the play is Smithson (in the book)—Ashley (in the play). They represent the departing guest broken by the crucible of Africa and are identical, being part of the organic structure—broken by *despair*.

The next character in order of importance in the book and in the play is—the coming guest; as Langford departs, Yale takes his place; in the book Huntington's place is taken temporarily by Moore and a promise is made of a new man to be sent out by Huntington.

There are incidental characters in the book and play practically counterparts—the skipper, engineer, missionary, half-breed.

The inanimate elements of conflict in the book and play are identical—Africa and all that Africa involves inanimately, that is, the scorching sun, the blistering

sand, the cloudless burned out blue, lonesomeness, lack of companionship, disease.

The elements of complication in book and play are substantially identical, consisting of the battle of emotions in the basic and secondary characters—Witzel and Moore tell Langford and Huntington respectively that they will suffer from dry rot; that they will fall for the negress.

The complication in book and play presents the same chain of episodes—the white man gradually becoming the victim of dry rot.

In book and play the crisis is—each causative character spiritually succumbs to damp rot. In each instance the soul of the causative character is destroyed through *despair*. In each instance Langford and Huntington respectively succumb to the negress. In "White Cargo" the crisis is the marriage of Langford and Tondelyo; in "Hell's Playground" the crisis is the concubinage of Huntington and Ndio.

In the book and in the play the climax is the same—the causative character, broken by despair, returns to England.

In "White Cargo" as in "Hell's Playground," the narrative, plot or story, in so far as organic structure is concerned, is the story of a virile young Englishman leaving England for the west coast of Africa; he arrives there; confronts Africa as is; comes in contact with substantially the same secondary characters; goes up against

the same elements of crucible, conflict, complication and crisis to the same climax.

In book and play the derivative situations are substantially identical.

The incidental detailed construction in book and play is substantially the same. We have already indicated the emotions of the secondary characters. The strata of society are practically identical. The *locale* is identical. The acts in the play are three and, in so far as an analogy might be made between a play and a book, they measurably follow the causative chain of episodes in the book. The scenes are practically the same. The props, the lighting, the costumes, the period, the time, the entrances and the exits may be concretely and succinctly correlated.

The orientation of the book and the play is identical. It presents a chain of white cargo—the white man leaves England for Africa; he arrives, in each instance, under substantially the same conditions; he replaces a white man who has gone before and who has been *broken by despair.* In each instance the causative character is broken by the despair of Africa. In each instance the white man, broken spiritually, returns to England. It is a case of Africa welcoming the coming, speeding the departing guest.

The narrative in the book is practically identical with the dialogue in the play.

The artistry in book and play consists in the fidelity with which book and play visualizes the motivation to

despair, the basic theme and the causative chain of sequential events.

In this case Judge Knox found that the play "White Cargo" was a dramatization of "Hell's Playground" and rendered judgment for the complainant.

In a case pending in the Federal Court of the Eastern District of New York, the complainant, Ossip Dymow, sued Guy Bolton, claiming that Dymow's play "Personality" was pirated by Bolton in "Polly Preferred." When these plays are analyzed through the Algebraic Formula it is emphatically demonstrable that the plays are entirely different. The theme of Dymow's play, "Personality," is *ambition*. The theme of "Polly Preferred" is *egotism*.

In Dymow's play, "Personality," the basic emotion or theme of ambition is personified in the character of the girl Nevada Devet. In "Polly Preferred" the basic emotion or theme of egotism is personified in the character of Bob Cooley.

In Dymow's play, "Personality," the crucible is *husband hunting*, whereas in "Polly Preferred" the crucible is promoting a corporation in which a girl is incorporated and constitutes the principal asset.

In "Polly Preferred" the elements of conflict are Bob Cooley, personifying egotism; Polly, personifying acting; Joe Rutherford, personifying lust.

In "Personality" Nevada Devet personifies ambition; Moore personifies idealism; Crumling, a flattened character without any particular emotion, and the

mothers, fathers and daughters, personify respectively jealousy.

In Dymow's "Personality" the complication grows out of Nevada Devet's ambition to marry Moore. In "Polly Preferred" the entire complication is in respect to business.

In Dymow's "Personality" the crisis grows out of the marriage game that Nevada Devet was playing. In "Polly Preferred" the crisis is at all times a business crisis.

In "Personality" the climax of the play is Nevada Devet wins and marries Moore. In "Polly Preferred" the climax is that Bob Cooley, the egotist, successfully exploits Polly Brown as a motion picture actress and incidentally marries her.

In "Personality" the narrative, plot or story is as follows: Nevada Devet, living in California, being ambitious to marry, comes to New York to live with a Mrs. Hughes. Nevada is brought in contact with a circle of society in which Mrs. Hughes moves; Nevada meets a Mr. Moore; falls in love with him; determines to secure him for a husband; is subjected to the competition of the catty society in which she is mingling; meets with social victory and defeat; finally she proposes to Moore and marries him.

In "Polly Preferred" the narrative, plot or story is as follows: Bob Cooley, a young man with ten cents in his pocket, meets a chorus girl named Polly Brown while in an automat restaurant; Bob's egotism impels

him to the conception of organizing a corporation, incorporating and promoting the chorus girl as a motion picture actress; he succeeds in creating the corporation; he meets with a number of victories and defeats; finally he puts her over as a motion picture actress; establishes his stock interest in the corporation and eventually marries the chorus girl.

The two plays do not have a single identical compartmented derivative situation. There is no identity in the incidental detailed construction.

In "Personality" the orientation is wholly disconnected from the basic theme or emotion of ambition. The orientation of "Personality" is a psychological one, proceeding from the idea of "if it is good for you, it is good for me; or, "follow the crowd."

The orientation of "Polly Preferred" is direct and proximate from the basic theme or emotion of egotism. Everything that Bob Cooley does in "Polly Preferred" can be directly traced or motivated to his egotism.

There is no parallel in the dialogue of either play, and it can hardly be said that there is any artistry in either play.

Notwithstanding an absolute dissimilarity of organic structure, Judge Garvin, in an opinion, holds that the defendant Bolton unconsciously plagiarized Dymow's play. The opinion, however, merely sets forth as a point of identity the *orientation of an idea*, mistaken by the court to be the *theme* of the play. "Commercializing a personality," indicated in the opinion to be the

basis of plagiarism, is not the *theme;* it is the *orientation of an idea* and is not subject to copyright preëmption.

If the Court is correct in its assumption, one could never construct a play from a prior orientation. For example: " . . . in 'The Blue Bird,' how happiness, which men are prone to seek far afield, oftenest lies at home," is shown in Chapter XVII. to have been the exact idea of the play "Capt. Applejack."

Is it possible that one may never write a play orientated from the idea—" 'Never forget that he is a slave, and that you are a queen,' " without plagiarizing Mary Carolyn Davies' play "The Slave with Two Faces?"

May it be said that any person who writes a play containing the underlying idea of—"a blackmailing mother, who is capable of great sacrifice under certain circumstances of an innocent child"—would be guilty of infringing "Lady Windemere's Fan?"

This question must be decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

INDEX

A

Abie's Irish Rose, 100, 130, 159, 190, 213, 226, 279, 309
Accident in playwriting, 87
Acting personified, 131
Acts of a play, 273
Adventure personified, 130
Algebraic Formula, 38
— —, applied in litigation, 332–336, 337–338
All God's Chillun Got Wings, 83, 129, 156, 173, 193, 214
Ambition as basic emotion, 90
"Analysis of Play Construction and Dramatic Principle"—Price, 5, 36, 48, 71, 86, 150, 164, 190, 237, 295
Andrews, Charlton, 6, 7, 70, 164, 186, 237, 249, 282, 301
Angel Intrudes, The, 132, 160, 176, 195, 215
Anticipation personified, 132
Anticipatory motive, 151
Antigone, The, of Sophocles, 155, 175, 196
Archer, William, 6, 65, 163, 185, 201, 237, 248, 262, 279, 299
Aria da Capo, 132, 159, 175, 195, 215
Aristotle, 6, 63
Arms and the Man, 135, 182, 200, 219, 231, 290
Articulation, 291
Artistry of a play, 321
As a Man Thinks, 131, 159, 169, 192, 213, 227
As You Like It, 130, 151, 161, 173

B

Baker, George P., 6, 45, 163, 185, 236, 237, 262, 279, 283, 296, 298, 303, 304
Barker, H. Granville, 7, 92, 249
Basic characters, 128–135
—, emotion, 2
— —, ambition, 85, 90
— —, deception, 129
— —, egotism, 122
— —, fear, 119, 129
— —, hallucination, 121, 129
— —, hatred, 129
— —, hilarity, 77
— —, hypocrisy, 128
— —, integrity, 81
— —, intrigue, 118
— —, jealousy, 126
— —, longing, 80
— —, love, 100, 120
— —, lust, 119, 129

Basic emotion, sumptuousness, 116
— —, tyranny, 129
— —, pre-eminence necessary, 144
—, emotions of plays, list, 103–106
Best People, The, 131
Better Ole, The, 90
Beyond Human Power, 135, 161, 180, 200, 218, 231, 288
Black Birds, 33
Blue Bird, The, 283, 346
Bolton, Guy, 278, 343
Bound East for Cardiff, 132, 160, 196, 215
Bragging personified, 131
Bride, The, 130
Brieux, Eugene, 79, 80, 81
Brunetière, Ferdinand, 163
Brunetière's law of the drama, 163

C

Candida, 182, 200, 219, 231, 290
Capt. Applejack, 160, 283, 346
Carlyle, 278
Castelvetro, Lodovico, 63
Cause and effect in a play, 150
Causative character, 87
— characters, 220–223
—, theme, 88–90
"Changing Drama, The"—Henderson, 8, 87, 107, 247, 270, 324, 325
Chanticleer, 126
Character, causative, 87
—, in a play, 111
—, invention of, 111
—, personifications, 128–134
Characters, basic, 128–135
—, complication between, 75
—, in or out of character, 126
—, invented by their emotions, 136
—, secondary, 264
Charity as a theme, 67
—, personified, 133
Cheaper to Marry, 119, 144
Cheating Cheaters, 19–35, 338
Cherry Orchard, The, 135, 148, 162, 180, 200, 218, 231, 288
"Chief Contemporary Dramatists," 243
Clark, Barrett H., 2, 5, 6, 8, 44, 47, 63, 86, 87, 91, 110, 115, 123, 128, 143, 150, 163, 165, 204, 229, 234, 239, 248, 279
Clearness in playwriting, 94
Climax, 219–232
Clod, The, 160, 172, 197, 215
Clothes, 277
Cobra, 119, 129
Cocaine, 132, 159, 175, 195, 215
Cohan, George M., 99
Coleridge, 87
Compartmentation, 251
Compartmented derivative situation, 256
Complication and/or intrigue, 183–200

Complication between characters, 75
Conflict, elements of, 167–181
—, in playwriting, 162
Construction, detailed, 262
Copyright infringement, 10–35, 329
Costumes, 277
Countess Julia, 136, 156, 206, 228, 276
Country Boy, The, 303
Courage personified, 133
"Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play, The"—Wilde, 6, 65, 164, 185, 237, 284, 300
Craig, Gordon, 4, 294
Crinoline Girl, The, 31
Crisis, definition of, 201–203
Critic, The, 35
Criticisms of a play, 44
Crucible, defined, 152
—, of *The Red Robe,* 81
—, of *Three Daughters of Monsieur Dupont,* 80
—, of various plays, 153–162
—, marriage, 80
—, playwriting, 74
—, sin, 83
—, the law, 81
—, war, 90
Curwood, James Oliver, 10
Cushing, Mildred, 143

D

Dam *v.* LaShelle, 336, 337
Damaged Goods, 79, 133, 161, 193
Dancing Mothers, 131
Darwin, Charles, 51, 98
Davies, Mary Carolyn, 284
Deception as basic emotion, 129
—, personified, 129, 130, 131
Delusion personified, 132
Derivative situation, 251
Desire personified, 130, 132, 143
Desire Under the Elms, 130
Despair personified, 130
Desperation personified, 131, 133
Dialogue of a play, 291
Disguise personified, 130
Doll's House, A, 101, 102, 153, 168, 194, 214, 226, 240, 252, 265, 280, 288, 296
Dove, The, 275
Drama and emotion, 50
—, the essentials of, 43
Dramatic situation, 255
"Dramatic Technique"—Baker, 6, 45, 163, 185, 236, 237, 283, 296, 298, 303
Dread as a theme, 67
Dryden, John, 63, 123, 143, 229, 234
Dumas, Alexander, 3

E

Egotism as basic emotion, 122
—, personified, 130, 131
Eichel *v.* Marcin, case of, 18–35
Element of complication, 183–200

Elements of conflict, 167–181
Emotion as an element of a play, 50
—, conflict in, 163
—, definition of, 50–53
—, of *ambition*, 66
Emotions, basic, list of, 103–106
—, compilation of, 55–62
—, variant, 142
Enemies, 132, 160, 176, 195, 215
Entertainment, an, definition of, 9
—, necessary, 108
—, *vs.* play, 73
Entrances, 279
Eugenically Speaking, 160, 197, 215
"European Theories of the Drama"—Clark, 2, 6, 7, 44, 47, 63, 86, 87, 91, 110, 115, 123, 128, 143, 150, 163, 165, 204, 229, 234, 235, 239
Exits, 280
Expressing Willie, 119, 129
"Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals"— Darwin, 51, 98

F

Faddism, 74
False Saint, A, 128, 158, 169, 189, 211, 216, 225, 257, 271
Fanny's First Play, 49
— — —, analysis of, 74, 78
Farmer's Wife, The, 130, 161, 323
Father, The, 135, 162, 180, 200, 218, 231, 268, 288
Faust, 136
Fear as basic emotion, 119, 129
—, personified, 129, 131
Firebrand, The, 131
Fitch, Clyde, 97, 152, 261
Fool, The, 67, 130, 139, 160, 184, 217, 223, 272, 274
Forgiveness personified, 131
"Foundations of a National Drama, The"—Jones, 9, 135
Freytag, Gustav, 1, 64, 88, 107, 135
Friendship personified, 132, 145
Fugitive, The, 133, 158, 176, 196, 216, 259, 281, 289

G

Galsworthy, John, 152
Gaol Gate, The, 161, 195, 214, 228
Garvin, Judge, legal decision, 345
Ghosts, 66–70, 101, 154, 173, 194, 214, 226, 266, 289
Goethe, 150, 151
Goose Hangs High, The, 130
Gorky, Maxim, 82, 281
Great Divide, The, 134, 179, 198, 217, 229, 288
Guardsman, The, 131

H

Hallucination as basic emotion, 121
—, personified, 129
Hamilton, Clayton, 4, 66, 249, 302
Hamlet, 277
Happy ending, 219
Hardness personified, 130, 134
Hatred as basic emotion, 129
—, personified, 129
Hauptmann, Gerhart, 249
Hazel, Judge, legal decision, 337
Hedda Gabler, 131, 154, 175, 196, 216, 281, 289
Helena's Husband, 160, 197, 216
"Hell's Playground," 339
Henderson, Archibald, 5, 8, 87, 88, 107, 247, 270, 324, 325
Hilarity as basic emotion, 77
Hindle Wakes, 128, 137, 157, 169, 189, 209, 225, 271, 273
Hour-Glass, The, 134, 161, 178, 199, 217, 229, 287
House of Glass, The, 20
Hugo, Victor, 2
Human emotions, compilation of, 55–62
Hyacinth Halvey, 161, 171, 195, 213, 227, 286
Hypocrisy as basic emotion, 128
—, as a theme, 97

I

I Am the Law, 10–18, 332
Ibsen, Henrik, 101, 112, 220, 266, 322
Idealism personified, 132
Illusion personified, 130, 132
Incidental detailed construction, 262
Independence personified, 130
Infringement, methods of determining, 40–42, 329–339
Injustice personified, 133
Innocence personified, 131, 132, 133
Integrity as basic emotion, 81, 118
—, personified, 137
International Film Co. *v.* Affiliated Distributers, case of, 10–18, 329, 331
Intrigue and/or complication, 183–200
Irony personified, 131

J

Jackdaw, The, 161, 171, 195, 213, 228
James, Henry, 5
Jealousy as basic emotion, 126
Jones, Henry Arthur, 7, 9, 135, 163, 165
Judge, The, 82, 89, 161, 197, 218, 228, 281

Justice, 158, 176, 197, 216, 259, 289

K

Know Thyself, 134, 147, 161, 180, 199, 218, 231, 288
Knox, Judge, on copyright infringement, 10–18, 336

L

Lady Windemere's Fan, 121, 133, 147, 161, 177, 197, 217, 228, 268, 276, 287, 325, 346
Law the crucible, 81
League of Youth, 131, 155, 174, 196, 216, 289
Legal opinions on literary piracy, 10–35, 336, 337, 345
Lewis, B. Roland, 7, 48, 72, 115, 238, 262, 285, 301
Lighting, 277
Lillo, George, 271
Literary piracy, 10, 329–339
Locale of a play, 272
Longing as basic emotion, 80
—, personified, 133
Love as basic theme, 100, 120
—, personified, 130, 132
Lower Depths, The, 159
Lust as basic emotion, 119
—, personified, 129

M

Macbeth, 71
Mack, Willard, 275
MacKaye, Percy, 97
Madness personified, 133
Madras House, The, 92, 110, 134, 152, 161, 178, 198, 217, 219, 228, 243, 261, 268, 287
Magda, 129, 155, 208, 216, 222, 225, 268, 272
Magistrate, The, 129, 156, 190, 212, 226, 271, 274
Manton, Judge, on copyright infringement, 19–35
Marriage as the crucible, 80, 153
Master Builder, The, 131, 154, 174, 196, 216
Maternity, 79, 132, 161, 194
Matthews, Brander, 41, 330
McNutt, Patterson, 143
Meddling personified, 130
Medicine Show, The, 160, 197, 227
Michael and His Lost Angel, 134, 147, 152, 161, 178, 198, 217, 228, 258, 287
Middleton, George, 278
Minick, 130
Mob, The, 133, 158, 197, 216, 258, 289
Modesty, 286
Mollusc, The, 129, 159, 191, 212, 226, 271
Motivation defined, 150
Motives, 151
Mrs. Dane's Defence, 129, 158, 188, 208, 225, 271
Mrs. Warren's Profession, 114,

135, 149, 162, 181, 200, 218, 231, 289

N

Narrative, defined, 233
Nervous Wreck, The, 129
Nevertheless, 160, 172, 197, 214, 227
New Way to Pay Old Debts, A, 118, 159, 172, 190, 191, 205, 215, 222, 267, 272
Night, 132, 160, 176, 195, 215
Not Smart, 132, 160, 196, 215

O

Œdipus, 165
Old English, 130
"On the Art of the Theatre"—Craig, 4, 294
O'Neill, Eugene, 83
Organic structure of a play, 107, 110
Orientation, 65
—, defined, 282
—, *vs.* theme, 72
Origin or initiative of a play, 47
Ostrovsky, 303
Othello, 168, 190, 203, 222
Ouspensky, P. D., 51, 52, 54
Outsider, The, 122, 263, 276
Outward Bound, 126
Overtones, 160, 197, 215

P

Parental love personified, 130
Passion personified, 136
Pelleas and Melisande, 134, 161, 180, 200, 218, 231, 277, 288
Perry, Bliss, 237
Personality, 343
— in spoken drama, 127
Personifications in *Fanny's First Play*, 75
— in *The Pigeon*, 67
Peter Pan, 130, 161, 174
Philanderer, The, 113, 135, 148, 162, 181, 206, 218, 231, 289
Pigeon, The, 67, 133, 158, 172, 194, 259, 289
Pigs, 143
Pillars of Society, 131, 154, 174, 196, 216, 289
Pinero, Arthur, 97, 151, 274
Piracy and copyright infringement, 10–35, 336, 337, 345
—, methods of determining, 40–42
Planning personified, 132
Play, court definition of, 10
—, conception of, 43
—, definition of, 40
"Play-Making"—Baker, 6, 65, 163, 185, 201, 237, 248, 299
"Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant," 112
Playwriting defined, 1–9, 36
—, the crucible, 74
Plot and/or theme, 233–242
— of *A Doll's House*, 240–242

Plot of *The Madras House*, 243
—, or story, 233
—, *v.* theme, 73
"Plots and Personalities," 236
Pollock, Channing, 67, 139, 160, 184, 223
Polly Preferred, 118, 130, 160, 268, 343
Polly With a Past, 132, 155, 177, 216, 278
Polti, Georges, 16, 46, 54
Preface of a play, 78
Price, W. T., 5, 37, 47, 71, 86, 150, 164, 190, 236, 262, 295
Progressive motive, 150
Props of a play, 276
Psychic echo, the, 52
Psychology of the play, 52
Pygmalion, 131, 155, 278

R

Rebellion personified, 131, 132
Red Robe, The, 81, 110, 134, 147, 158, 161, 180, 199, 218, 230, 268, 288
Resentment personified, 131
Retardative motive, 151
Retrogressive motive, 151
Retrospective motive, 151
Return of Peter Grimm, The, 132, 159, 170, 192, 213, 227
Rehearsal, The, 35
Richelieu, 160, 172, 194, 215, 227
Riders to the Sea, 178, 198, 217
Rising of the Moon, The, 161, 171, 195, 213, 228
Romance, 132, 159, 170, 193, 213, 227
Romance personified, 132
Rosmersholm, 131, 155, 174, 196, 216, 289

S

Sacrifice as a theme, 67
—, personified, 130, 132, 133
Sarcey, 3
"Sartor Resartus," 278
Scarecrow, The, 97, 126, 134, 161, 179, 199, 218, 230, 277, 288
Scenes of a play, 275
Schiller, 47, 86
Science in constructing plays, 118
Scornful Lady, The, 230
Second action undesirable, 185
Second Mrs. Tanqueray, The, 97, 134, 161, 177, 198, 217, 228, 287
Secondary characters, 166, 264
Secret Strings, 33
See My Lawyer, 20
Selfishness personified, 133
Selwyn, Edgar, 303
Servant in the House, The, 95, 118, 127, 160, 168, 195, 217, 268
Seven Keys to Baldpate, 99, 130
Shading, 94

Shakespeare, 222, 294
Shakespeare's characters, 135
Shaw, Bernard, 49, 74–78, 112, 126, 162, 220, 326
Silence, 130
Simonton *v.* Gordon, case of, 41, 330, 339
Sin as the crucible, 83
Six Who Pass While the Lentils Boil, 160, 194, 214, 227
Slave With Two Faces, The, 284, 346
Sophocles, 155, 175, 196
Spinoza, 51
Spreading the News, 161, 171, 195, 213, 227
Stevens, Alfred, 324
Stop Thief, 31
Storm, 303
Story of the play, 65
Strata of society, 269
Strife, 134, 152, 161, 178, 198, 217, 228, 287
String of the Samisen, The, 132, 160, 176, 196, 215
"Studies in Stagecraft"—Hamilton, 4, 66, 249, 302
"Study of the Modern Drama, A"—Clark, 8, 87, 128, 234, 248, 279
Sumptuousness as a theme, 116
—, as basic emotion, 116
Sun Up, 273
Suppressed Desires, 132, 159, 175, 195, 215
"Sure fire" stock situations, 184

T

Tailor-Made Man, The, 278
Technique of entrances, 280
"Technique of the Drama"—Freytag, 88, 107, 135
"Technique of the One-Act Play"—Lewis, 7, 48, 72, 115, 238, 285, 301
"Technique of Playwriting, The"—Andrews, 6, 70, 164, 186, 237, 249, 282, 301
"Tertium Organum"—Ouspensky, 51, 52
Theme, causative, 88–90
—, compared with *plot*, 73
—, functions of, 73
—, of the play, 63–85
—, the *subject*, not the *story*, 65
—, *vs.* orientation, 72
Themes, examples cited, 67–80
They Knew What They Wanted, 131
"Thirty-Six Dramatic Situations, The"—Polti, 15, 54
Three Daughters of Monsieur Dupont, The, 79, 133, 161, 170, 193
Thunderbolt, The, 151, 157, 177, 196, 216, 259
Time, 278
Traveling Man, The, 161, 195, 214, 228
Trimplet, The, 160, 171, 197, 214, 227
Truth, The, 97, 134, 147, 152,

161, 178, 198, 217, 229, 261, 287
Torture as a theme, 81
Tyranny as basic emotion, 129

U

Unchastened Woman, The, 132, 159, 170, 193, 213, 227
Unity of action in plays, 91
Unscrupulousness personified, 131

V

Vale of Content, The, 134, 147, 161, 179, 199, 218, 230, 288
Valley of Silent Men, The, 332
Value of the Algebraic Formula, 293
Vanity personified, 132
Voltaire, 44
Von Schiller, 235
Voysey Inheritance, The, 247

W

War as the crucible, 90
Weavers, The, 134, 161, 179, 199, 218, 230, 249, 288
Wedding Presents, 19–35, 338
What Price Glory, 66, 90, 131
White Cargo, 130, 273, 277, 280, 281, 339
Widowers' Houses, 135, 148, 162, 181, 200, 218, 231, 289
Widow's Veil, The, 132, 160, 196, 215
Wild Duck, The, 131, 133, 154, 173, 191, 214, 220, 259, 260, 267, 275, 276, 281, 289
Wilde, Percival, 6, 65, 164, 185, 237, 262, 284, 300
Witching Hour, The, 134, 147, 161, 179, 198, 217, 230, 276, 288
Workhouse Ward, The, 161, 171, 214, 228

Y

You Never Can Tell, 326
Young, Stark, 83

Facsimile Reproduction of Author's Work Sheet for Comparing Two Plays by Bernard Shaw

TITLE OF PLAYS.

	Arms and the Man		You Never Can Tell
A	Adventure	A BASIC EMOTION OR AN ELEMENT IN OR OF A BASIC EMOTION CONSTITUTING THE THEME:	Adventure
	PLUS		PLUS
B	Bluntschli	PERSONIFIED	BY CHARACTER Valentine
	PLUS		PLUS
C		MOTI-	VATED
	PLUS		PLUS
C_1	THRU CRUCIBLE		THRU CRUCIBLE C_1
	men and women		men and women
C_2	CONFLICT		CONFLICT C_2
	adventure--Bluntschli romance--Raina rashness--Saranoff jealousy--Louka parental--Petkoff parental--Catherine service--Nicola		adventure--Valentine pride--Gloria hardness--Crampton secretiveness--Mrs. Clandon inquisitiveness--Dolly volubility--Philip tact--William command--Bohun counsel--McComus
C_3	AND COMPLICATIONS TO ULTIMATE		AND COMPLICATIONS TO ULTIMATE C_3
	war Raina (romance) gives Bluntschli (adventure), pursued by sol-		adventure Valentine (adventure) meets pride (Gloria); Valentine meets the

CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OF THE PLAY.

F10 TIME
night-morning--afternoon

F11 ENTRANCES
Bluntschli's important

F12 EXITS
Bluntschli's important

G ORIENTATED THRU ITS CONSTITUENT

PLUS
men and women are adventurous burlesquers

H ARTICULATED

PLUS
dialogue typically Shavian mostly relevant to the emotional theme of adventure interspersed with keen satire and irony, including, however, many irrelevant lines

I IMAGED WITH

dependent upon Shavianism

THE MAST HOLDS THE UNDERLYING IDEA

F10 TIME
morning--noon--afternoon--evening

F11 ENTRANCES
Crampton meets his family

F12 EXITS
family leave Valentine waiting

G ELEMENTS DRAMATURGICALLY EXPRESSED

PLUS
men and women are adventurous burlesquers

H BY WORDS

PLUS
dialogue typically Shavian, mostly irrelevant to emotional theme of adventure; play lacks unity of Arms and the Man, few of the lines being relevant

I ARTISTRY

dependent upon Shavianism: action and plot thin

These two plays of Shaw have the same emotional theme, the same underlying idea and basic character, an adventurer. The crucible is the same, the fable or plot distinct, the emotional conflicts are distinct; the plays offer a splendid illustration of comparative analysis under the algebraic formula and how distinct plays may be written from the same emotional theme and orientation of an underlying idea.

L COMPARTMENTED BY

PLUS

boudoir adventure
escape of Bluntschli
return of Bluntschli
character of Bluntschli
life of Bluntschli
inheritance of Bluntschli
success of Bluntschli

DERIVATIVE SITUATIONS E

PLUS

dental parlor adventure
luncheon adventure
afternoon adventure
evening adventure

F DRESSED UP BY INCIDENT-

PLUS

F1 SECONDARY CHARACTERS
Raina
Saranoff
Louka
Petkoff
Catherine
Nicola

F2 STRATA OF SOCIETY
soldiers and servants

F3 LOCALE
Bulgaria

F4 THE ACTS
three

F5 SCENES
boudoir--garden--library

F6 PROPS
significant bag

F7 LIGHTING
unimportant

F8 COSTUMES OR CLOTHES
Petkoff's coat

AL DETAILED CONSTRUCTION F

PLUS

SECONDARY CHARACTERS F1
Gloria
Crampton
Mrs. Clandon
Dolly
Philip
William
Bohun
McComas

STRATA OF SOCIETY F2
middle-class servants

LOCALE F3
English watering-place

THE ACTS F4
four

SCENES F5
dental office--hotel terrace--sitting room

PROPS F6
dental--seaside etc.

LIGHTING F7
unimportant

COSTUMES OR CLOTHES F8
unimportant to lead

NATURGICAL EXPRESSION OF THE UND

koff returns; Saranoff returns; Saranoff disillusioned; Petkoff's coat; Saranoff flirts with Louka; Louka betrays Raina Raina's sanctuary to Bluntschli is uncovered; Bluntschli aids Saranoff; Louka pursues Saranoff

C4 CRISIS AND

Petkoff's coat threatens disclosure; Raina lies to Bluntschli; duel threatens; Raina assails Saranoff; Raina's romance with Saranoff shattered

C5 CLIMAX

adventure (Bluntschli) to marry romance (Raina)

D PROGRESSED BY NARRATIVE PLOT OR STORY D

PLUS

a defeated adventurous soldier finds sanctuary in a romantic young woman's boudoir and thus escapes pursuit; after peace is declared revisits the lady, aids her father and fiance, meets above complications, wins romantic young woman.

LYING IDEA ORIENTATED THRU THE CON

wittingly brings family together; Valentine becomes entangled in burlesque family; Valentine loves Gloria; struggle between adventure and pride

CRISIS AND C4

adventure and pride involved in family battle; adventure and pride dominated by commanding lawyer Bohun

CLIMAX C5

adventure and pride marry; Shaw's burlesque man and woman

PLUS

Valentine a poverty-stricken dentist, an adventurer, meets a burlesque family and becomes one of them

HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.
AUG 84
N. MANCHESTER,

Saint Joseph's University
39353001322344